The Riverside Press Cambridge

REFERENCE LIBRARY

DATE

TITLE _____

_____

AUTHOR _____

EDITION _____ SERIES _____

TYPE _____ PLATES _____

PAPER _____

Method of Printing { TEXT _____ / INSERTS _____

COVER _____

SUBCONTRACT DATA _____

_____

REMARKS _____

_____

"H M Co. Form 0-412 5M 7-47 BP"

REFERENCE LIBRARY * HOUGHTON MIFFLIN CO. * BOSTON, MASS.
Archive
Collection
This book may not leave the Office
borrowed must be returned within 7 days

THE SONNETS OF SHAKESPEARE

THE SONNETS OF SHAKESPEARE

From the Quarto of 1609
with variorum readings and commentary

EDITED BY

RAYMOND MACDONALD ALDEN

BOSTON & NEW YORK
HOUGHTON MIFFLIN COMPANY
The Riverside Press Cambridge
1916

COPYRIGHT, 1916, BY RAYMOND MACDONALD ALDEN

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

Published September 1916

TO

B. H. A.

HAPLY I THINK ON THEE; AND THEN MY STATE,
LIKE TO THE LARK AT BREAK OF DAY ARISING
FROM SULLEN EARTH, SINGS HYMNS AT HEAVEN'S GATE.

PREFACE

THE Sonnets of Shakespeare have a place beside the play of *Hamlet* in contention for the doubtful honor of being the cause of more perplexity and controversy than any other literary work in the English tongue. More persons, otherwise seemingly normal members of society, have thought that they were the first to understand one or the other of these works, or have professed to make illuminating discoveries regarding them, than could be computed as critics of any writing since the *Iliad*. If the present editor can come to the end of his task with any feeling of complacency, it is because he has spent some years with the Sonnets and still finds himself without a revelation. In other words, his complacency must be due only to the existence of some evidence that he is still sane — a poor substitute, no doubt, for the enthusiasm of the seer. It is the purpose of this volume, then, not to present a new theory of the Sonnets, but to bring together a body of critical material illustrative of them, sufficient for all the purposes of the less ambitious reader, and adequate to set the most tireless student on the track of what he wishes to know.

The Bibliography is intended to serve as a convenient outline of the history of the text and its interpretation; but it may be well to say something here of the general course of this history. Though seemingly among the fairly popular lyrical collections of the seventeenth century, the Sonnets largely dropped out of sight toward the end of that century and through the greater part of the eighteenth century. The age, therefore, of the building of the modern text of Shakespeare's plays saw no similar work accomplished for the Sonnets, which were not even included in any edition of the Works of Shakespeare (save in occasional supplementary volumes) until Ewing's Dublin edition of 1771, and not again till Malone's of 1790. It is to Malone that we owe, in effect, the acceptance of the narrative and lyrical poems as a part of the standard Shakespeare text; and it is also to him, in large measure, that we owe the modern text of the Sonnets. Practically all the well-known editors of Shakespeare of the nineteenth century, beginning with Boswell (but with the exception of Singer), paid due attention to the Sonnets, and, together with numerous lesser commentators, from time to time proposed improvements in the text; but it cannot be said that it was given to any later critic to add in a distinguished way to the textual work of Malone, — though it was given to a number of his successors to reject certain of his errors. Dyce's conservative work on the text, in the Aldine edition of the *Poems* (1832) and in his *Works of Shakespeare*, should perhaps be mentioned. In 1866 the Cambridge editors (Clark and Wright) issued the ninth volume of their Shakespeare, containing the Sonnets, and gave for the first time something like a history of the text up to that period, which was brought down to 1893 in the revised edition. The Cambridge edi-

tors, however, were not so disconcerting as to leave nothing to be done in the way of correction and completion of their textual apparatus, even within the limits which they set for themselves; and, as every student of the Shakespeare text is aware, they made no effort to do more than list the *first appearance* of every lection, so that one can learn nothing from their notes regarding the weight of opinion on any disputed matter. Since 1893 nothing of importance has been done on the history of the text of the Sonnets. The text of Wyndham, in the *Poems* of 1898, is notable for its conservative tendency, many abandoned readings of the Quarto having been restored and defended in this edition, with variable but — on the whole — doubtful success. Samuel Butler's text, of 1899, is distinguished for the opposite extreme, admitting many new readings which no other editor has felt justified in accepting. Of the very numerous separate editions of the Poems or Sonnets which have appeared since the end of the nineteenth century, two classes may be distinguished: those which follow, in general, the text of the Globe or other standard edition of Shakespeare, and those which, under antiquarian influences, attempt something like a reproduction of the original Quarto text, though admitting a minimum of corrections, — as, for example, Morris's Kelmscott reprint and that in the "Tudor and Stuart Library" of the Clarendon Press. Aside from the photographic facsimiles made by Praetorius and by the Clarendon Press, the Quarto text has been reproduced with almost complete accuracy in the American "First Folio Edition."

The upshot of this development of the text is that it is a matter of general agreement that the Sonnets Quarto of 1609 was not published under the author's supervision, or corrected with such care as to make it an authoritative text. On the other hand, the number of serious errors in the printing, such as make real difficulties for the commentator, is relatively small. Aside from matters of spelling and punctuation, something between fifty and fifty-five errors have been corrected by the agreement of the great majority of editors; of these corrections nine were made in the *Poems* of 1640, eight by Gildon (assuming that he edited the *Poems* of 1710 and 1714), and thirty by Malone — though of these a number were first suggested by Theobald, Tyrwhitt, or Capell. There remain some eighteen passages* where editorial emendations are in marked disagreement, and it is very doubtful whether these *cruces* will ever be solved.

In the matter of interpretation, Malone's edition was even more decidedly the pioneer than in the matter of the text, and his notes (including those of Steevens) furnished the only important commentary on the Sonnets, one might say, for nearly a century; though creditable additions were made by Knight and Dyce in England, Hudson in America, and Delius in Germany. It is astonishing, however, how many difficulties and problems Malone and his successors ignored. The first really critical introduction and commentary to the Sonnets appeared in Dowden's edition of 1881, accompanied with an excellent

* In 11, 11; 16, 7; 16, 10; 23, 9; 24, 1; 28, 14; 46, 9; 51, 10; 51, 11; 58, 11; 62, 10; 69, 14; 85, 3; 112, 14; 113, 14; 126, 2; 135, 13; 146, 2.

working bibliography; and from that time to the present the body of annotation has been steadily increased, notably by the work of Tyler, Wyndham, Beeching, and Sidney Lee.* Aside from the notes made by editors, a large amount of criticism in the same field appeared in separate books and articles throughout the nineteenth century. The chief theories of the Sonnets which have been presented and discussed during this whole period may be conveniently summarized as three in number: (1) the personal or autobiographic, (2) the fictional or imaginative, and (3) the mystical or esoteric. The first was set forth by Malone, when he said that to one W. H., "whoever he was, 126 of the following poems are addressed; the remaining 28 are addressed to a lady." Following this general view came the proponents of Southampton and of Pembroke, thus setting in motion a long train of arguments, doubtless not yet brought to an end. The personal interpretation was also developed influentially by Charles Armitage Brown (1838), whose view of the Sonnets might be said still to dominate the body of criticism on the subject. The second theory, that the Sonnets are primarily imaginative in character, has been discussed less in English-speaking countries than in Germany, where it received an impetus from so distinguished a scholar as Delius, in 1865. In its earlier form, according to which the Sonnets were a product of Shakespeare's imagination in much the same sense as the plays, this theory has been echoed more and more faintly during recent years, though it has had the support in England of Dyce, Halliwell-Phillipps, and Henry Morley, and in America of Hudson and Thomas R. Price. In another form, according to which the Sonnets were written in a kind of competitive following of a lyrical fashion of the Renaissance, the imaginative interpretation has had the persistent support of Sir Sidney Lee, and in Germany has lately been reënforced by the studies of Wolff. The third theory, the mystical, is not one but many, standing for a type of interpretation through which the Sonnets are viewed as of esoteric or symbolic significance, usually of a more or less spiritual character. Of these interpretations the earliest is Barnstorff's (1860), in Germany, which was followed by not a few efforts of kindred spirits in both America and England. Still a fourth group might be made of Massey's theory, and one or two similar ones, according to which the Sonnets were written concerning real (personal) situations, but those not of Shakespeare himself but of certain friends. This view of Massey's, supported with more abundant detail and more impassioned devotion than that of any other writer, found two or three followers in Germany, like Krauss and von Mauntz, but has not commended itself to any noteworthy English or American critic.

As has appeared from this summary, the personal view of the Sonnets, according to which the great body of them is viewed as having to do with real friends and experiences of the poet, emerges generally dominant from the long debate. But when we seek to separate the personal element in detail from the

* Nor should the name of Alexander Schmidt be forgotten here, for his Lexicon gave the same careful attention to the Sonnets as to the plays, often with valuable results. Dowden's notes, in particular, are often unacknowledged echoes of Schmidt's — though I do not mean to imply any lack of candor in the use of so familiar an authority.

elements which are in part admittedly conventional, and still further when we seek for biographic particulars, identifications, and the like, criticism tends to be increasingly agnostic. The Southamptonists and Pembrokists are still with us; the ghost of Mary Fitton is not yet wholly at peace; but the saner and more competent of recent critics, like Dowden, Furnivall, Churton Collins, Luce, Mackail, Beeching, and Walsh, show a wholesome distrust of the effort to read in the Sonnets a definite biographical narrative. This agnosticism is strengthened, too, by the persistent suspicion that the Sonnets have not come to us altogether in their original order, and that that order cannot, in all probability, be restored. The reaction against the excesses of biographic interpretation has been increased by the studies of Sir Sidney Lee, and it seems clear that our understanding of the Sonnets can never be quite the same that it was before these studies revealed the extent and character of the sonnet writing of the Renaissance; yet on the other hand competent criticism is nearly unanimous in the view that Lee is too little disposed to realize the extent to which an artificial form may express a real experience and be saturated by personal feeling. Because a wedding ring is of itself insufficient proof of marital affection, it does not follow that one who wears a wedding ring is to be assumed to be married only in name. On the other hand, too much stress can scarcely be laid on the wholesome and rational habit of withholding belief from the thousand biographical inferences which have been drawn from the Sonnets, without a scintilla of proof, apparently merely because human nature abhors a vacuum of knowledge where Shakespeare is concerned.

Respecting the intrinsic value of the Sonnets, we may distinguish three stages of modern comment. The early modern editors of Shakespeare viewed them with indifference and, as we have seen, with neglect. Dr. Johnson does not vouchsafe them a word, — a circumstance which we need not regret, since he doubtless viewed them as at least no better than the sonnets of Milton, which he disposed of by the statement that "of the best it can only be said that they are not bad." Steevens's comment has become notorious, to the effect that an Act of Parliament could not compel the reading of the Sonnets of Shakespeare. Here again, as elsewhere, Malone introduces the new day. Led by Wordsworth and Coleridge, the poets and critics of the early nineteenth century adopted with substantial unanimity the opinion of the former that in none of Shakespeare's writings "is found, in equal compass, a greater number of exquisite feelings felicitously expressed"; the only notable dissenters were Hazlitt and Hallam. The climax of the age of appreciation may perhaps be found in Swinburne's article of 1880, in which he speaks of the later sonnets, concerned with the dark lady, which have been relatively neglected save for biographic conjectures, as "incomparably the more important and altogether precious division" of the collection. In recent years there has been a perceptible tendency, as in the criticism of Shakespeare's dramatic work, to distinguish frankly between those elements in the Sonnets which are "of an age," and are characterized either by the eccentricities of Petrarchan and Elizabethan poetic fashion or by temporary and individual conditions of expression, and those which

represent a lyrical power and beauty valid "for all time." Not many go so far as a recent German critic, who groups the Sonnets according as they are *unsittliches*, *absurdes*, and *triviales*, with a small saving residuum of *Edelsteinen;* but one may recognize without shame a growing courage to distinguish between what is believed to be inferior, coincident with the courage to acclaim what is excellent. The æsthetic criticism of the Sonnets has been impeded by the exaggerated attention attracted to disputed aspects of the biographic problem, but of late it has developed with some hopefulness; notable in this respect is the edition of the Poems of Shakespeare made by the late George Wyndham, which, as Dean Beeching observes, "deserves the thanks of all lovers of poetry for the resolute way in which it keeps before the reader that the one thing of importance in the Sonnets is their poetry." How many of the Sonnets should eventually be culled out as worthy of being cherished no matter by whom written, how, or when, we cannot expect to be able wholly to agree; perhaps a not much larger number than might be chosen from the same standpoint, out of the work of other great sonneteers — Sidney, Wordsworth, and Rossetti. But the world's judgment is now secure that in these best of the Sonnets of Shakespeare we find no less truly revealed the supreme lyrical powers of English poetry than its supreme dramatic powers are exhibited in his greater plays.

I must now return from this hurried survey of the criticism represented in this book to the method of the book itself. To exhibit the history of the text, a list of texts had to be made *de novo*, though of course with important aid received — for the earlier periods — from the Cambridge editors. The apparatus in the "First Folio Edition" is wholly inadequate, and the monumental *New Variorum* fails us, for recent textual history, even in respect to complete editions of Shakespeare, owing to the point of view, repeatedly explained therein, that "the text of Shakespeare has become, within the last twenty-five years, so settled that to collate, word for word, editions which have appeared within these years, would be a mark of supererogation." That there is much supererogatory labor in any such collation I should be the last to deny, having found no pleasure in noting where Herford puts a colon, Rolfe a semi-colon, Craig a period. But if, as is very frequently the case, the chief use to be made of a textual apparatus is to discover the weight of editorial opinion on disputed issues, it is clear that recent editorial opinion, where the text has been reworked with care, is often of at least equal weight with that of the editors of a century ago; hence, with all humble reverence for the *New Variorum Shakespeare*, I can see no adequate reason for the omission, in its later issues, of the collation of such newly made texts as those of Craig, Neilson, and Bullen. For the Sonnets, of course, there must be numerous additions to the list of editions of the plays. I have tried, then, to collate all editions of the Sonnets, whether found by themselves or in the collected Works of Shakespeare, of which the text appears to be the result of fresh and significant editorial consideration.

For the commentary it was my first intention to limit myself to criticism which seemed distinctly worthy of attention; but I soon found, as others have

done, that to make this distinction was to arrogate to the editor unwarranted authority. In the end, encouraged by the generous attitude of the publishers in the matter of allowance of space, I have sought to represent substantially all comment which was susceptible of being normalized to the plan of the book, including much with which I have little or no sympathy. In general, however, space has not been given to interpretation of the kind which I have called mystical or esoteric. The point of view of this sort of interpretation is so distinct from that which makes use of the usual methods of philological and historical criticism that for the most part it cannot be made to blend with these to any advantage. In the body of the notes I have taken occasion more than once to record a protest against that view of Shakespeare which considers that he made a practice of writing words intended to mean two or three different things at the same time. The symbolic type of the poetic imagination is one easily recognizable in the Renaissance, as in the mediæval period; and, admitting that Shakespeare occasionally availed of it for illustrative or rhetorical purposes, it seems to some of us that nothing could be more remote from his normal methods of thought and expression. Characteristically, the outlines of his ideas are defined clearly, as by daylight, not blurred or doubled as in the half-lights of allegory or mysticism. Whether this be true or no, the esoteric methods of interpretation, like ciphers and other riddles, must be worked out by themselves, for those whose perceptions are of a kind to demand them. Yet, wishing to err on the side of completeness rather than of negligence, I have made place, now and then, for certain interpretations, especially those concerning the alleged platonism of the poet, which go beyond the point where I can follow. For a thorough and satisfactory consideration of the place of platonism in the poetry of Shakespeare and his contemporaries, we have still to wait.

Notes respecting the disputed place of a sonnet in the order of the whole collection, or respecting its relative date, or having to do with some biographic interpretation such as the Pembroke or the Southampton theory, have been included in the body of the commentary only where they might throw some light on the interpretation of the particular passage concerned. Obviously such notes cannot be well understood except as portions of complete arguments for special theories of dates, order, or identification. These topics, therefore, have been segregated in the Appendix.

It is very difficult to judge how far such an edition should go in recording the "parallel passages" which have been noted by commentators. If all were included, the resulting bulk would be alarming, for the game is a fascinating one when once entered upon with zeal. The effort has been to discriminate, though I dare not claim to have done so with consistency, and to note those parallels which appeared to be suggestive for the interpretation of the passage in question or might be thought to have significance for its date, — not those of merely curious interest.

Readers who use the commentary with seriousness must learn as soon as possible to read notes with due allowance for the bent of the individual critic. They must remember, for example, that the comments of Wyndham and of

Miss Porter are based on an abnormal desire to maintain the Quarto text; that those of Tyler are likely to be connected with the Pembroke theory, those of Massey with his peculiar form of the Southampton theory, and those of Lee with his different form of the same; that those of Samuel Butler are colored by his view of the Sonnets as of very early date; and that those of Dowden are frequently due to his extraordinary efforts to present the separate poems as forming a perfectly continuous series. It is the distinguishing merit of the notes of Dean Beeching — perhaps uniquely among the important editions — that they represent no idiosyncrasy or pet theory of interpretation, and are therefore peculiarly suited to be taken at their face value. Shall I be presumptuous if I express the hope that my own comments, few enough at the worst, may have some claim to this particular merit? since, as has been hinted already, I have listened to all the schools of interpretation without having become a proselyte of any.

It is to state the self-evident to add, what I should nevertheless be ashamed to omit to say, that this book would probably never have been made, at least in its present form, without the example of the work of the late Dr. Horace Howard Furness. Though the editorial problems of the Sonnets are somewhat different from those of the plays, and though I have ventured a word of criticism of one detail of the apparatus of the *New Variorum Shakespeare*, Dr. Furness has been my teacher, in an important sense, from first to last; and it will be my happiness if I shall seem not only to have learned from him something of the mechanics of the editorial art but to have caught any portion of the clarity and poise of his spirit. It is good to be able to remember that he once gave friendly aid and appreciation to the first bit of scholarly work that I ever undertook, and that his son and successor, Mr. H. H. Furness, Junior, has done the same for the present undertaking.

Mention must also be made of certain manuscript notes which have been graciously put at my disposal by friends who have been students of the Sonnets. One of these friends, my late colleague, Professor A. G. Newcomer, would have had a larger part in this volume if it had not been for his untimely death. Another colleague, Professor Henry David Gray, has put me under repeated obligation. Mr. Horace Davis of San Francisco turned over to me notes representing the leisure-hour studies of many years, some of which give eloquent testimony to the utilities of amateur scholarship. Matter from all these sources is duly acknowledged in the body of the commentary. The Shakespeare Bibliography of Mr. William Jaggard has been of great service, and I am also indebted to its editor for cordial personal assistance, for the use of his collection of Shakespeareana at Stratford-on-Avon, and for useful notes made on certain of my proof-sheets even while he was absent from home on duty with his regiment. The pursuit of perfection in a bibliography is one of the most vain of human endeavors; that the one included in this volume is not more imperfect than it is, I owe not only to the labors of Mr. Jaggard but to the friendly aid of Professor Clark Northup of Cornell University and Dr. Samuel Tannenbaum of New York City. Dr. Tannenbaum in particular has exerted him-

self to mitigate the limitations of my library with assistance notable equally for disinterested zeal and painstaking accuracy. Living at a distance from any adequate Shakespearean collections, I cannot hope to have avoided errors which the opportunity to verify notes gathered in many places might have prevented; I shall be very grateful to any who may furnish corrections. But in compensation I am happy to remember the excursions made here and there in pursuit of my task, and the generous help received from those connected with many libraries: the British Museum, Bodley's Library at Oxford, Trinity College Library at Cambridge, the Public Library of Birmingham, the Shakespeare Memorial Library at Stratford-on-Avon, the Boston Public Library, and the libraries of Harvard University and of the Universities of Michigan, Illinois, and Pennsylvania.

I regret that the recent revision of Sir Sidney Lee's *Life of Shakespeare* came to hand too late to be used in the commentary. The additions made to his chapters on the Sonnets, however, have appeared in earlier publications, and are duly noted in this book; the page references to the *Life* are restricted to the first edition. Another item too late for use in the commentary is the important article by Dr. Wolff in a recent number of *Englische Studien;* I have taken the more pains to indicate its contents in the Appendix.

The facsimile title-page, Dedication, and head-piece at the beginning of the text are from the Praetorius reproduction of the copy of the Sonnets Quarto in the British Museum. In the case of the last (the head-piece and caption on page 15) the original is enlarged about one-ninth.

I conclude this Preface at the season when the whole world commemorates the three hundredth anniversary of the death of the writer of these Sonnets. If, from his place in the undiscovered country, he may be thought to look upon us mortals who busy ourselves with the stuff of his immortality, "increasing store with loss and loss with store," may his assured mastery of the art of forgiveness reach its acme, and his quality of mercy drop even upon his commentators!

R. M. A.

STANFORD UNIVERSITY, CALIFORNIA.
April, 1916.

EXPLANATION OF TEXTUAL NOTES

THE following editions have been fully collated for variant readings, and are indicated by the abbreviations standing opposite them. For fuller identification, see the Bibliography.

1640	Poems (Benson), 1640.	Wh^1	Works (White), 1865.
L	Poems (Lintott), 1710.	Hal	Works (Halliwell), 1865.
G^1	Poems (Gildon), 1710.	Cam^1	Works (Cambridge), 1866.
G^2	Poems (Gildon), 1714.	Dy^2	Works (Dyce), 1866.
S^1	Poems (Sewell), 1725.	Del^3	Works(Delius), 1872.
S^2	Poems (Sewell), 1728.	Co^3	Works (Collier), 1878.
E	Poems (Ewing), 1771.	Do	Sonnets (Dowden), 1881.
M^1	Supplement (Malone), 1780.	Hu^2	Works (Hudson), 1881.
M^2	Works (Malone), 1790.	R^1	Sonnets (Rolfe), 1883.
A	Poems (Aldine), 1832.	Wh^2	Works (White), 1883.
Kt	Works (Knight), 1843.	Ty	Sonnets (Tyler), 1890.
Co^1	Works (Collier), 1858.	Ox	Works (Oxford), 1891.
B	Poems (Bell), 1855.	Cam^2	Works (Cambridge), 1893.
Del^1	Works (Delius), 1856.	Wy	Poems (Wyndham), 1898.
Hu^1	Works (Hudson), 1856.	But	Sonnets (Butler), 1899.
Dy^1	Works (Dyce), 1857.	Her	Works (Herford), 1900.
Co^2	Works (Collier), 1858.	Be	Sonnets (Beeching), 1904.
Sta	Works (Staunton), 1860.	R^2	Sonnets (Rolfe), 1905.
Cl	Works (Cowden-Clarke), 1864.	N	Works (Neilson), 1906.
Gl	Works (Globe), 1864.	Bull	Works (Bullen), 1907.
Del^2	Works (Delius), 1864.	Wa	Sonnets (Walsh), 1908.
Kly	Works (Keightley), 1865.		

Other abbreviations are as follows: —

C	Capell (MS. corrections in Lintott's ed.).
Stee	Steevens (notes in Malone).
Th	Theobald (do.).
Tyr	Tyrwhitt (do.).
Bo	Works (Boswell-Malone), 1821.
Tu	Sonnets (Tudor ed.), 1913.

Readings from the Boswell edition are noted only when they differ from those of Malone, 1790; readings from the Tudor edition when they differ from those of Neilson, on whose text the Tudor text is based.

It should be noted that the Aldine edition of the *Poems* was edited by Dyce, and in the textual notes of the Cambridge editors is referred to as Dyce, 1832.

"Etc." indicates that the reading in question is found in all the editions which, in the above list, follow the one just named.

"Conj." is added to all readings not found in the body of a text.

Variations of spelling are not noted except where there is a possibility of doubt as to the word intended, or where (as in the earlier editions) they may have significance for the history of textual usage. Variations of punctuation are not noted except where the sense may be affected; the change from another mark of punctuation to ? is usually indicated; that from ? to ! is not.

EXPLANATION OF THE COMMENTARY

WHEN no page reference is given for a note, it is quoted from the commentary of an editor on the sonnet in question. When page reference is cited without title, it is from the only work of the author on the Sonnets. Special cases are these: notes from Massey are from his later work, *The Secret Drama of Sh.'s Sonnets;* references to Schmidt are to the Lexicon; references to Abbott and Franz are to their Grammars.

All matter enclosed in square brackets, not signed by the editor, represents the substance, but not the exact phrasing, of the author cited.

Quotations made by commentators have been verified and corrected, and references to act, scene, etc., have been corrected or supplied, without special remark. Quotations from Elizabethan texts have, in general, been modernized in spelling and punctuation. Those from Shakespeare are from the text of Neilson (Cambridge Poets); those from the other sonneteers are usually quoted from the volumes of *Elizabethan Sonnets* in the New English Garner.

The notes in Malone's commentary signed "C," which are generally believed but not positively known to be Capell's (see Wright, Cambridge Sh., 2d ed., vol. 9, p. xviii), are quoted under Capell's name with a prefixed asterisk.

CONTENTS

DEDICATION 5

THE SONNETS 15

APPENDIX 375

GENERAL CRITICISM 377

THE TEXTS OF 1609 AND 1640 417

THE ARRANGEMENT OF THE SONNETS 424

THE DATE OF COMPOSITION 441

SOURCES AND ANALOGUES 453

THE FRIEND 464

THE RIVAL POET 472

"WILLOBIE HIS AVISA" 478

MUSICAL SETTINGS 483

BIBLIOGRAPHY 485

INDEXES

INDEX TO BIBLIOGRAPHY 527

INDEX TO THE COMMENTARY 531

INDEX OF FIRST LINES 539

SHAKE-SPEARES

SONNETS.

Neuer before Imprinted.

AT LONDON
By *G. Eld* for *T. T.* and are
to be ſolde by *Iohn Wright*, dwelling
at Chriſt Church gate.
1609.

TO.THE.ONLIE.BEGETTER.OF.
THESE.INSVING.SONNETS.
Mr. W. H. ALL.HAPPINESSE.
AND.THAT.ETERNITIE.
PROMISED.

BY.

OVR.EVER-LIVING.POET.

WISHETH.

THE.WELL-WISHING.
ADVENTVRER.IN.
SETTING.
FORTH.

T. T.

DEDICATION

[The discussion which has raged about this Dedication is very difficult to condense. I omit here all that portion of it which concerns the identification of "Mr. W. H.," for which see Appendix, pp. 464–71. — Ed.]

Malone [does not discuss the general character or phrasing of the Dedication, but in connection with his mention of Tyrwhitt's suggestion that W. H. was William Hughes (see note on S. 20, 7) he implies that W. H. was the "begetter" in the sense of the person to whom Sonnets 1–126 were addressed.]

Chalmers: How he [Mr. W. H.] was the *begetter* of them it is not easy to tell, unless we presume, what is not improbable, that he begot a desire in Sh. to deliver a copy to the Bookseller, for publication: W. H. was the *getter* of the MS., imperfect as it was, from which the Sonnets were printed. (*Suppl. Apology*, 1799, p. 52.) [In a subsequent note (p. 90) he cites Skinner as deriving "beget" from A. S. *begettan, obtinere:*] Johnson adopts this derivation and sense; so that "begetter," in the quaint language of Thorpe the Bookseller, Pistol the ancient, and such affected persons, signified the *obtainer;* as "to get" and "getter" in the present day mean "obtain" and "obtainer."

Drake: On the first perusal of this address, the import would seem to be, that Mr. W. H. had been the *sole object* of Sh.'s poetry, and of the eternity promised by the bard. But a little attention to the language of the times in which it was written will induce us to correct this conclusion; for as a part of our author's sonnets is most certainly addressed to a female, it is evident that W. H. could not be the "only begetter" of them in the sense which primarily suggests itself. [Chalmers gives the true meaning.] . . . We must infer, therefore, that Mr. W. H. had influence enough to obtain the MS. from the poet, and that he lodged it in Thorpe's hands for the purpose of publication, a favour which the bookseller returned, by wishing him "all happiness and that eternity" which had been "promised" by the bard, in such glowing colours, to another, namely, to one of the immediate subjects of his sonnets. That this is the only rational meaning which can be annexed to the word "promised" will appear, when we reflect that for Thorpe to have wished W. H. the "eternity" which had been promised for him by an "ever-living" poet, would have been not only superfluous, but downright nonsense; the "eternity" of an "ever-living" poet must necessarily *ensue*, and was a proper subject of congratulation, but not of wishing or of hope.

Boswell: The "begetter" is merely the person who *gets* or *procures* a thing, with the common prefix "be" added to it. So, in Decker's *Satiromastix:* "I have some cousin-germans at court shall beget you the reversion of the master of the King's Revels." Knight [pursues Drake's argument that

the fact that some of the sonnets are addressed to a female disposes of the assertion that Mr. W. H. was the "only begetter" in the sense of only inspirer.] COLLIER [does the same, and agrees that the dedication was written in compliment of W. H. for "collecting Sh.'s scattered sonnets from various parties." (Intro., 2d ed., 6 : 588.)]

[Practically no progress was made in this discussion, then, during the first half of the 19th century. But in 1862 M. PHILARÈTE CHASLES, Director of the Mazarin Library, proposed an entirely new interpretation in a communication to the *Athenæum* of Jan. 25 (p. 116), to the following effect:] 1st. That we have here no dedication, properly so called, at all, but a kind of monumental inscription. 2d. That this inscription has not one continuous sense, but is broken up into two distinct sentences. 3d. That the former sentence contains the real inscription, which is addressed *by* and not *to* W. H. 4th. That the person to whom the inscription is addressed is, for some reasons, not directly named, but described by what the learned call an *Antonomasia* ("the onlie begetter of these insuing sonnets"). 5th. That the latter sentence is only an appendage to the real inscription. 6th. That the publisher, in the latter sentence, is allowed to express his own good wishes (not for an eternity of fame to the begetter of the sonnets, which would be an impertinence on his part), but for the success of the undertaking in which he (the adventurer) has embarked his capital. . . . Stripped of its lapidary form [i.e., a form modeled on ancient lapidary inscriptions], the inscription will then run thus: "M. W. H. wisheth to the only begetter of these insuing Sonnets all happiness and that eternity promised by our ever-living poet." "The well-wishing adventurer in setting forth [is] T. T." [In the issue of Feb. 16, 1867, in reply to Massey's discussion in *Sh.'s Sonnets never before Interpreted*, Chasles pursued the subject further, observing,] Most dedications of the Elizabethan age are written in the same form, the name of the dedicator following closely that of the dedicatee, and the verb being left at the end of the sentence. . . . Thomas Thorpe's addition is a mere signature, a flourish, a postscriptum. (p. 223.) [Still more followed, to the same effect, in the issue of April 13, p. 486. And in the issue of May 18 Chasles opposed the notion that "begetter" could mean "obtainer," by citing (p. 662) 31 passages in Sh. where "beget" = "create." It should be added that Chasles believed his interpretation of the Dedication would be seen to be obvious if only its typographical arrangement were accurately reproduced in modern editions, and certain editors, notably Collier, hastened to point out that they had so reproduced it. Others joined merrily in the discussion, chiefly with a view of pointing out how Chasles's arguments bore on their own pet theories. CARTWRIGHT, editor of *Sonnets of Sh. Rearranged* (1859), in a letter to the *Ath.*, Feb. 1, 1862 (p. 155), points out that Thorpe does not assert that the sonnets themselves are inscribed to W. H.; the text does not read "promised *him*"; hence it may have been meant to say, "that eternity promised to his friend." MASSEY (*Ath.*, March 16, 1867, p. 355) takes a similar view. In the issue of April 27, replying to Chasles's argument respecting the spacing of the lines of the Dedication,

he says:] The spacing between the words "wisheth" and "the well-wishing" is exactly the same as between the three preceding lines. Which amounts to this: the four central lines of the inscription are more *leaded* than the lines at the beginning and end of the same. . . . If we are to draw any inference from the printer's arrangement, then the larger spacing of the three lines preceding the word "wisheth" shows an intention of carrying on the inscription, and proves it to be all one! (p. 551.) [On the other hand, BOLTON CORNEY (*N.* & *Q.*, 3d s., 1 : 87) accepts the Chasles reading, and applies it to the furtherance of the identification of W. H. as Southampton; and SAMUEL NEIL (*Ath.*, April 27, 1867, p. 552) accepts it in furtherance of his own view of the Dedication as intelligible without going beyond the limits of Sh.'s own family, W. H. being his brother-in-law William Hathaway (a view which Chasles had independently proposed), and the "begetter" perhaps his wife Anne. Neil's rendering of "begetter" is "suggestor," i.e., the "adviser of the production of the book as a substantive assertion of his right among the lettered poets of his time." Thereafter little was heard of Chasles's interpretation of the Dedication, most Englishmen doubtless agreeing with DYCE:] The idea of M. Chasles that the inscription consists of two distinct sentences, appears to me a groundless fancy; and his notion that, in the first of those sentences, "Mr. W. H." is the nominative to the verb "wisheth," offends me as a still wilder dream. (*Life*, 3d ed., p. 102 n.) C. EDMONDS [again discussed the Dedication in *Ath.*, Nov. 22, 1873, p. 661:] Whoever has laughed, as I have done, over [Thorpe's facetious dedications, e.g., of Marlowe's Lucan, 1600; Healey's Epictetus and Cebes, 1610; *Oldcombian Banquet*, 1611,] will not be surprised at his penning such a characteristic and familiar inscription to the W. H. of the Sonnets, in 1609. But what a different and highly deferential style does he adopt when, in 1616, he dedicates his enlarged edition of Healey's work to William Herbert, Earl of Pembroke! I should imagine the true interpretation of the inscription to be that "T. T." the publisher, . . . feeling deeply indebted to "Mr. W. H." for having obtained for him the privilege of publishing such a popular work as Sh.'s Sonnets were likely to be, wishes him all happiness, and that eternity promised by the great bard to those who are instrumental in preserving things which the world "would not willingly let die." And this thought was probably suggested by the first lines in *L. L. L.*:

> Let fame, that all hunt after in their lives,
> Live register'd upon our brazen tombs
> And then grace us in the disgrace of death;
> When, spite of cormorant, devouring Time,
> The endeavour of this present breath may buy
> That honour which shall bate his scythe's keen edge
> And make us heirs of all eternity.

E. LICHTENBERGER [in 1877 issued at Paris a thesis *De Carminibus Shaksperi, cum nova Thorpianae Inscriptioni Interpretatione*. The new interpretation is merely to the effect that the Dedication was written particularly for the first

group of sonnets, those on procreation and marriage, and need not be understood to apply to the whole collection. In it the writer wishes Mr. W. H. immortality through a son as well as through the services of poetry.]

DOWDEN [quotes the passage from Dekker cited by Boswell, but dissents from the view that "begetter" in the Dedication means "obtainer."] There is special point in the choice of the word, if the dedication be addressed to the person who inspired the poems and for whom they were written. Eternity through offspring is what Sh. most desires for his friend. If he will not beget a child, then he is promised eternity in verse by his poet, in verse "whose influence is thine, and born of thee" (78, 10). Thus was Mr. W. H. the begetter of these poems, and from the point of view of a complimentary dedication he might well be termed the *only* begetter. (Intro., p. 21.) HALLIWELL-PHILLIPPS: [The "only begetter" is] the one person who obtained the entire contents of the work for the use of the publisher. . . . The notion that "begetter" stands for "inspirer" could only be received were one individual alone the subject of all the poems; and, moreover, unless we adopt the wholly gratuitous conjecture that the sonnets of 1609 were not those which were in existence in 1598, had not the time somewhat gone by for a *publisher's* dedication to that object? (*Outlines*, 8th ed., 2: 305.) SHARP [observes that "only" may mean not *sole*, but "matchless," "incomparable"; cf. "only herald" in 1, 10. (Intro., p. 23.)]

[The *N. E. D.* gives some comfort to those who interpret "begetter" as "obtainer" by citing *Hamlet*, III, ii, 8: "You must acquire and beget a temperance," under the definition "get, acquire"; but on the other hand cites the word "begetter" in the present passage under the definition "agent that originates, produces, or occasions."]

TYLER: To the "only begetter" eternity had been "promised by our everliving poet;" for no other construction is at all reasonable or probable. There is thus a manifest reference to the numerous places in the Sonnets in which the poet promised to the beautiful youth he addressed "a life beyond life." . . . [The view that Mr. W. H.'s merit was that of collector of the Sonnets] can scarcely appear in any way likely. Moreover, there is in the Sonnets one place particularly which should go very far towards determining the sense of the disputed words, [38, 5–14.] Here the beautiful youth appears as the cause of the poet's writing verses "worthy perusal." Whoever invokes this powerful aid is to "bring forth eternal numbers to outlive long date." The quotation thus made must go far towards fixing the sense of "the only begetter." . . . [As to the objection that the beautiful youth is not the subject of all the Sonnets:] he is the subject of very much the larger portion, and this portion, moreover, stands first, and next after the Dedication. He might, therefore, very well be spoken of as "the onlie begetter of these insuing sonnets." (pp. 13–14.)

VERITY: Surely it was a *dies nefastus* on which these ill-omened words [of the Dedication] were written; surely the man who penned them was capable of all the infamies which Horace assigned to the unknown planter of a certain tree; *capable*, as Voltaire said of "meek, unconscious" Habakkuk, *capable de tout*. Who was this impalpable "W. H."? What does "only begetter" mean? . . .

The words seem so simple; as if they could only mean one thing; as if "begetter" must be equivalent to "inspirer." [Against this there are ingenious arguments;] but the majority of writers agree that "begetter" *does* mean "inspirer," and that "*only* begetter" might fairly be said of the person to whom 126 of the sonnets are directly addressed, and with whom the remaining poems are more or less concerned. (Intro., pp. 399–401.)

LEE: Few books of the 16th or 17th century were ushered into the world without a dedication. In most cases it was the work of the author, but numerous volumes, besides Sh.'s Sonnets, are extant in which the publisher (and not the author) fills the *rôle* of dedicator. The cause of the substitution is not far to seek. The signing of the dedication was an assertion of full and responsible ownership in the publication, and the publisher in Sh.'s lifetime was the full and responsible owner of a publication quite as often as the author. . . . When a volume in the reigns of Elizabeth or James I was published independently of the author, the publisher exercised unchallenged all the owner's rights, not the least valued of which was that of choosing the patron of the enterprise, and of penning the dedicatory compliment. . . . As a rule one of only two inferences is possible when a publisher's name figured at the foot of a dedicatory epistle: either the author was ignorant of the publisher's design, or he had refused to countenance it, and was openly defied. [In the case of the Sonnets the former is the natural explanation.] . . . In framing the dedication Thorpe followed established precedent. Initials run riot over Elizabethan and Jacobean books. Printers and publishers, authors and contributors of prefatory communications, were all in the habit of masking themselves behind such symbols. Patrons figured under initials in dedications somewhat less frequently than other sharers in the book's production. But the conditions determining the employment of initials in that relation were well defined. The employment of initials in a dedication was a recognized mark of a close friendship or intimacy between patron and dedicator. It was a sign that the patron's fame was limited to a small circle, and that the revelation of his full name was not a matter of interest to a wide public. . . . There was nothing exceptional in the words of greeting which Thorpe addressed to his patron "Mr. W. H." They followed a widely adopted formula. Dedications of the time usually consisted of two distinct parts. There was a dedicatory epistle, which might touch at any length, in either verse or prose, on the subject of the book and the writer's relations with his patron. But there was usually, in addition, a preliminary salutation confined to such a single sentence as Thorpe displayed. . . . There is hardly a book published by Robert Greene between 1580 and 1592 that does not open with an adjuration before the dedicatory epistle, in the form: "To ——— ——— Robert Greene wisheth increase of honour with the full fruition of perfect felicity." Thorpe, in Sh.'s Sonnets, left the salutation to stand alone, and omitted the supplement of a dedicatory epistle; but this, too, was not unusual. [Cf. Spenser's dedication of *F. Q.*; Drayton's of *Idea* and *Poems Lyric and Pastoral;* Braithwaite of his *Golden Fleece.*] But Thorpe was too self-assertive to be a slavish imitator. His addiction to bombast, and his elementary appreciation of literature, recom-

mended to him the practice of incorporating in his dedicatory salutation some high-sounding embellishments of the accepted formula, suggested by his author's writing. In his dedication of the Sonnets to " Mr. W. H." he grafted on the common formula a reference to the immortality which Sh., after the habit of contemporary sonnetteers, promised the hero of his sonnets in the pages that succeeded. . . . It is obvious that he did not employ " begetter " in the ordinary sense. " Begetter," when literally interpreted as applied to a literary work, means father, author, producer, and it cannot be seriously urged that Thorpe intended to describe " Mr. W. H." as the author of the Sonnets. " Begetter " has been used in the figurative sense of inspirer, and it is often assumed that by " only begetter " Thorpe meant " sole inspirer," and that by the use of those words he intended to hint at the close relations subsisting between " W. H." and Sh. in the dramatist's early life; but that interpretation presents numberless difficulties. It was contrary to Thorpe's aims in business to invest a dedication with any cryptic significance and thus mystify his customers. Moreover, his career and the circumstances under which he became the publisher of the Sonnets confute the assumption that he was in such relations with Sh. or with Sh.'s associates as would give him any knowledge of Sh.'s early career that was not public property. . . . When Thorpe had the luck to acquire surreptitiously an unprinted MS. by " our ever-living poet," it was not in the great man's circle of friends or patrons, to which hitherto he had had no access, that he was likely to seek his own patron. . . . " Beget " was not infrequently employed in the attenuated sense of " get," " procure," or " obtain," a sense which is easily deducible from the original one of " bring into being." Hamlet, when addressing the players, bids them " in the very whirlwind of passion acquire and beget a temperance that may give it smoothness." [See also the passage in Dekker, quoted by Boswell.] Mr. W. H., whom Thorpe described as " the only begetter of these ensuing sonnets," was in all probability the acquirer or procurer of the MS., who, figuratively speaking, brought the book into being either by first placing the MS. in Thorpe's hands or by pointing out the means by which a copy might be acquired. To assign such significance to the word " begetter " was entirely in Thorpe's vein. (*Life*, pp. 391–92, 397–99, 404–05.)

Butler, [(*Ath.*, Dec. 24, 1898, p. 907), writing without reference to Lee's argument, traces the history of the view that " begetter " means " obtainer," and remarks that it has always been the resort of advocates of a doubtful theory of the Sonnets. To this Alfred Ainger replies (Jan. 14, 1899, p. 59), defending Lee's view, and asserting that Sh. himself uses " beget " in the general sense of " procure " quite as often as in the sense of producing children. He further suggests that the Dedication may be humorously intended, like Thorpe's dedication of Marlowe's Lucan to his friend Blount, — that he] is indulging a like strain of chaff at the expense of Mr. W. H. himself, suggesting that he will obtain immortality (that of a fly in amber) by going down to posterity as the " dedicatee " of Sh.'s " ever-living " poems. If this was so, Mr. Thorpe has proved himself a prophet of no common order. [Further, on Jan. 28,

p. 121:] I do not suppose that even Mr. Lee would plead that the word "begetter" was a natural word for Mr. Thorpe to have used. But the whole style of the dedication is euphuistic — the vein of Armado or Osric — and the first thought of euphuists of that calibre was never to use a common word when an uncommon one would do.

BUTLER, [in his edition of the Sonnets, 1899, reproduces the contents of his letter of the preceding year, and argues at length against the Lee interpretation of "begetter." His most important contribution concerns the passage from Dekker's *Satiromastix*, first cited by Boswell:] Struck with the fact that Dr. Murray has not cited the foregoing passage from Dekker, . . . I turned to Dekker's *Satiromastix*, and find that the passage in question is put into the mouth of Sir Rees Ap Vaughan, a Welshman, who by way of humour is represented as murdering the English language all through the piece. I then understood why Dr. Murray did not refer to it and why Mr. Sidney Lee [did not repeat the reference in his *Life of Sh.* which he had given in the *D. N. B.*]; but I did not and do not understand how Boswell could have adduced it, unless in the hope of hoodwinking unwary readers, who he knew would accept his statement without verifying it. This single factitious example has done duty with Southamptonites and impersonalites for the last 80 years, without anyone's having been able to cap it with another. . . . Another consideration of less weight . . . arises from the prefixing the word "only" to "begetter" in Thorpe's preface. The fact that the Sonnets are so almost exclusively conversant, directly or indirectly, about a single person, suggests that they would all be in the hands of this person, whoever he may have been. . . . In this case, supposing "begetter" to mean nothing more than "procurer," the addition of the word "only" appears too emphatic for the occasion — "begetter" alone should have been ample. If on the other hand Mr. W. H. was the only cause of the Sonnets having been written at all, the fact is one of sufficient interest and importance to make record reasonable even in a preface so tersely worded as the one in question. Again, the word "only" had, through the Creed, become so inseparably associated with "begotten," that I cannot imagine any one's using the words "only begetter" without intending the verb "beget" to mean metaphorically what it means in "only begotten." (Intro., pp. 28–30.)

LEE [(*Ath.*, Feb. 24, 1900, p. 250) renews his defense of his interpretation, citing definitions in Cotgrave and other Elizabethan lexicons; the Dekker and *Hamlet* passages again; *Lucrece*, 1005, "That makes him honour'd, or begets him hate"; Jonson, *Magn. Lady*, I, Epilogue, "Beget him a reputation." In general, he alleges, "get" and "getter," "beget" and "begetter," were always interchangeable in Elizabethan usage; cf. "getter" for "begetter" in *Cor.*, IV, v, 240: "A getter of more bastard children." To this DOWDEN replies at length, in the issue for March 10, p. 315, asserting roundly that no unmistakable Elizabethan example of the word "beget" in the sense of "procure" has been found. Cotgrave (who had been cited by Lee) does not give "begetter" as "procurer," but gives both words, in distinct definitions, as equiva-

lents of *Engendreur*. Skinner (also cited by Lee) does not gloss "beget" with *obtinere*, but only the A.S. *begettan;* for "beget" the gloss is *gignere*. The Sh. and Jonson passages he finds to be examples of the meaning "call into being" or "produce," not of the meaning "procure." He also points out (independently, it would seem, of Butler) the dubious character of the Dekker passage, and gives for the first time the full context: "If I fall sansomely upon the Widdow, I have some cossens Garman at Court, shall beget you the reversion of the Master of the Kings Revels." (Later, March 24, p. 379, DOWDEN explains that, when in his Introduction to the Sonnets, he had admitted that this passage furnished an example of "beget" = procure, he had not examined it sufficiently.) LEE rejoins (March 17, p. 345), defending his interpretation of the *Hamlet* passage, where "acquire and beget" are naturally taken as synonyms; citing a new reference from Coles's English-Latin Dictionary (1677), where one finds "Beget (procure), *concilio, pario*"; and an additional Sh. reference, *T. of S.*, I, i, 45: "Such friends as time in Padua shall beget." In the same number (p. 346) AINGER also replies to DOWDEN, summing up the whole argument by saying that "the primary meaning was 'bring about.' . . . In Mr. Lee's interpretation of the famous phrase, W. H. is addressed as the man who 'brought about' the publication of the Sonnets." This furnishes BUTLER an easy opportunity for retorting (March 24, p. 379): "Few will object to reading, 'Bringer about of these ensuing sonnets.' Where is the legitimacy of smuggling in the words 'the publication of'?"]

BEECHING: "The only begetter" [is] a phrase which ninety-nine persons out of every hundred, even of those familiar with Elizabethan literature, would unhesitatingly understand to mean their inspirer, and, in view of such sonnets as 38, 76, and 105, and of the metaphors employed in 78 and 86, would regard as especially well chosen. . . . What force would "only" retain if "begetter" meant "procurer"? Allowing it to be conceivable that a piratical publisher should inscribe a book of sonnets to the thief who brought him the MS., why should he lay stress on the fact that "alone he did it"? Was it an enterprise of such great peril? Mr. Lee attempts to meet this and similar difficulties by depreciating Thorpe's skill in the use of language; but the examples he quotes in his interesting Appendix do not support his theory. Thorpe's words are accurately used, even to nicety, and, indeed, Mr. Lee himself owns that in another matter Thorpe showed a "literary sense" and "a good deal of dry humour." I venture to affirm that this dedication also shows a well-developed literary sense. In the next place, this theory of the "procurer" obliges us to believe that Thorpe wished Mr. W. H. that eternity which the poet had promised, not to him, nor to men in general, but to some undesignated third party. Mr. Lee calls the words "promised by our ever-living poet" "a decorative and supererogatory phrase." That is a very mild qualification of them under the circumstances. But an examination of Thorpe's other dedications shows that his style was rather sententious than "supererogatory." Then, again, on this theory the epithet "well-wishing" also becomes "supererogatory." For what it implies is that the adventurous publisher's motive in giving

the sonnets to the world without their author's consent was a good one. The person to whom they were written might reasonably expect, though he would not necessarily credit, an assurance on this head; but what would one literary jackal care for another's good intentions? . . . I would add that the whole tone of the dedication, which is respectful, and the unusual absence of a qualifying phrase, such as " his esteemed friend," before the initials, are against the theory that Mr. W. H. was on the same social level as the publisher. (Intro., pp. xxxiv–xxxvi.)

[Undeterred by his opponents, LEE renews the exposition of his theory in his introduction to the Oxford Press facsimile edition of the Sonnets, 1905:] " Begetter " might mean " father " (or " author ") or it might mean " procurer " (or " acquirer "). There is no suggestion that Thorpe meant that Mr. W. H. was " author " of the sonnets. Consequently doubt that he meant " procurer " or " acquirer " is barely justifiable. [He renews his list of examples, including the Dekker passage — still without the broken English. Further:] A very few years earlier a cognomen almost identical with " begetter " (in the sense of procurer) was conferred in a popular anthology, entitled *Belvedere or the Garden of the Muses*, on one who rendered its publisher the like service that Mr. W. H. seems to have rendered Thorpe, the publisher of Sh.'s Sonnets. One John Bodenham, filling much the same *rôle* as that assigned to Mr. W. H., brought together in 1600 a number of brief extracts ransacked from the unpublished, as well as from the published, writings of contemporary poets. Bodenham's collections fell into the hands of an enterprising " stationer," one Hugh Astley, who published them under [the above title, with a dedicatory sonnet to John Bodenham, in which he was apostrophized as] " First causer and collectour of these floures." In another address to the reader at the end of the book . . . the publisher again refers more prosaically to Bodenham, as " The Gentleman who was the cause of this Collection " (p. 235). When Thorpe called " Mr. W. H " " the only begetter of these insuing sonnets," he probably meant no more than the organizers of the publication of the book called *Belvedere*, in 1600, meant when they conferred the appellations " first causer " and " the cause " on John Bodenham, who was procurer for them of the copy for that enterprise. (pp. 38–40.) [LEE also observes (p. 35 n.) that Thorpe's dedicatory procedure and choice of type were influenced by Jonson's form of dedication before the first edition of *Volpone*, which Thorpe published for him in 1607 and which Eld printed.] On the first leaf, following the title, appears in short lines (in the same fount of large capitals as that used in Thorpe's dedication to " Mr. W. H.") these words: " To the Most Noble | and Most Aequall | Sisters | The Two Famovs Vniversities | For their Love | And | Acceptance | Shewn | To his Poeme | in the Presentation | Ben: Ionson | The Gratefvll Acknowledger | Dedicates | Both It and Himselfe."

W. C. HAZLITT: It would be a severe injustice to Thorpe to omit or refuse to concede that credit . . . which it strikes me that he eminently deserves, as the first person who appears to have presaged the enduring fame of the author. He terms him " Our Ever-Living Poet "; and he so terms him in 1609, subse-

quently to the far less emphatic tribute by Jonson in *Poetaster* in 1602, but years before Jonson pronounced his eulogium in the folio of 1623, and years upon years before any one else dreamed of taking such a view. (*Sh., the Man and his Work*, ed. 1912, p. 222.)

[The Dedication has not escaped the ingenuity of the more mystical interpreters. KARPF (*Die Idee Sh.'s*, p. 43) believes that the " only begetter " is the poet's own soul; and LEGIS (*N. & Q.*, 5th s., 6: 421) that it is the " ' spirit of human knowledge ' which is the begetter of all true works."]

SHAKE-SPEARES, SONNETS.

I

FROM fairest creatures we desire increase,
That thereby beauties *Rose* might neuer die,
But as the riper should by time decease,
His tender heire might beare his memory:
But thou contracted to thine owne bright eyes,
Feed'st thy lights flame with selfe substantiall fewell,
Making a famine where aboundance lies,
Thy selfe thy foe, to thy sweet selfe too cruell:
Thou that art now the worlds fresh ornament,
And only herauld to the gaudy spring,
Within thine owne bud buriest thy content,
And tender chorle makst wast in niggarding:
Pitty the world, or else this glutton be,
To eate the worlds due, by the graue and thee.

2. **might**] *may* G, S, E.
3. **decease**] *decrease* Hu².
6. **lights**] *life's* But, Wa. **selfe substantiall**] Hyphened by G², etc.
10. **only**] *early* Godwin conj.
12. **chorle**] *churl* G, etc.
14. **by the**] *be thy* Stee conj.; *by thy* Godwin conj. **and**] *as* Godwin conj.

BOADEN: I have been tempted frequently to consider [Sonnets 1–19], and many more of the collection, as parts of a design to treat the subject of Adonis in the sonnet form. [The resemblance between these opening sonnets and

the *V. & A.* has been remarked by many commentators, most recently by Judge Evans, *Sat. Rev.*, Dec. 26, 1914. Cf. especially lines 163–74:]

> Torches are made to light, jewels to wear,
> Dainties to taste, fresh beauty for the use,
> Herbs for their smell, and sappy plants to bear;
> Things growing to themselves are growth's abuse.
> Seeds spring from seeds and beauty breedeth beauty;
> Thou wast begot; to get it is thy duty.
>
> Upon the earth's increase why shouldst thou feed,
> Unless the earth with thy increase be fed?
> By law of nature thou art bound to breed,
> That thine may live when thou thyself art dead;
> And so, in spite of death, thou dost survive,
> In that thy likeness still is left alive.

ISAAC: Cf. Daniel's *Delia*, Sonnets 34–35:

> Look, Delia! how we 'steem the half-blown rose, . . .
> No sooner spreads her glory in the air,
> But straight her full-blown pride is in declining;
> She then is scorned, that late adorned the fair.
> So clouds thy beauty, after fairest shining! . . .
> O let not then such riches waste in vain!
> But love, whilst that thou may'st be loved again! [etc.]

[After examining the parallels here, Isaac concludes, because of the equally striking parallels in *V. & A.* and some of the early plays, that Sh. was probably the first to develop the idea. (*Jahrb.*, 17:177–81.)] MASSEY: Cf. Sidney's *Arcadia:* " Beauty . . . is the crown of the feminine greatness; which gift, on whomsoever the heavens (therein most niggardly) do bestow, without question she is bound to use it to the noble purpose for which it is created." [1590 ed., f. 279.] . . . [These] sonnets on marriage could not have been written until after Sh. had read the *Arcadia.* (pp. 73, 71.)

VERITY [also cites as a parallel Drayton's *Legend of Matilda;* but the resemblance is confined to a few lines in stanzas 34 and 70:

> Hoard not thy beauty, when thou hast such store;
> Were 't not great pity it should thus lie dead,
> Which by thy lending might be made much more?
> For by the use should every thing be fed. . . .
> 'T were pity thou by niggardise shouldst thrive,
> Whose wealth by waxing craveth to be spent.]

LEE: The opening sequence of 17 sonnets, in which a youth of rank and wealth is admonished to marry and beget a son so that " his fair house " may not fall into decay, can only have been addressed to a young peer . . . who was as yet unmarried. (*Life*, p. 142.) [On this see further the notes on S. 13.

— Ed.] Walsh: It has been supposed that these sonnets were actually addressed by Sh. to a Mr. W. H., or to some friend or patron, with the *bona-fide* intention of persuading him to marry, although (except for a slight allusion in 9, 1, and still slighter in 8, 6–9) there is not a word in them on the subject of marriage. It is possible. It is also possible that they are imaginary. . . . Possibly some of these sonnets were composed with the intention of representing [the wooing of the fair young friend by the dark lady of certain of the sonnets]. If so, we should have here the same situation as in the poem of *V. & A.*, in which Venus urges Adonis to breed, in words very similar to some here repeated. [Cf. lines 129–32, 751–68.] . . . At all events, it is not improbable that most of the sonnets in this section were written about the same time with *V. & A.* . . . Ideas similar to the chief topic now under treatment are found in the plays only in application to women. Cf. *R. & J.*, I, i, 221–26; *T.N.*, I, v, 259–61; *A.W.*, I, i, 136–78.

Delius [believes this group of sonnets to be one of the striking disproofs of the personal or autobiographical theory of the collection.] In order to persuade a friend to marry, many kinds of reasons could profitably be urged: concern for his own moral and material welfare in the founding of a domestic circle or in the respected position of a husband and father; the desirable possession of a feminine personality, distinguished for beauty, wit, birth, or property, which the poet might, with this intention, sketch in the most alluring colors; finally, if the friend were an Earl of Southampton or a Pembroke, a reference to *Noblesse oblige*, — to the obligation not to let a noble race die out, but to progress in distinction. Of all these and similar grounds with which a man of flesh and blood might persuade a real friend to marriage, we find in all these sonnets not one so much as touched upon, and instead of them only this one argument, discussed even to satiety: You are beautiful, and must therefore care for the preservation of your beauty through reproduction, — an argument which, in Story-land and addressed to the coy Adonis by lovesick Venus, might find some justification, but which could never, in the actual relations of life, have been seriously advanced by a reasonable man such as we take Sh. to have been, in order to persuade another — it is to be hoped also reasonable — man, his friend, to marry. (*Jahrb.*, 91: 36–37.)

1–2. Simpson: The doctrine which Sh. puts into the two opening lines of his sonnets, to be as it were the text and motto of the whole, [is Platonic]. With Plato . . . Love is universally, in the highest and lowest forms alike, an impulse of generation. . . . Its first human impulse is to produce a semblance of immortality by generating, through a person beloved for beauty, a new person, to replace the original one in its decay (*Symposium*, c. 32), and thus to preserve the immortality of the species amidst the destruction of the individual. Of this impulse Beauty is the fuel; and love kindled by beauty is not precisely the love of beauty, but of generation in the beautiful. *ἐστὶ γὰρ οὐ τοῦ καλοῦ ὁ ἔρως, ἀλλὰ τῆς γεννήσεως καὶ τοῦ τόκου ἐν τῷ καλῷ.* (pp. 19–20.)

2. Rose. [The use of italics here has given rise to much discussion, edifying

more or less. The note of Wyndham, on "The Typography of the Quarto, considered in its bearing on the authority of that text," p. 259 of his edition of the *Poems*, and Sir Sidney Lee's introduction to the Oxford facsimile edition, well represent the opposing attitudes. See further on *Hews* in 20, 7. — Ed.] Wyndham: Excepting *Rose*, 1, 2; *Hews*, 20, 7; *Informer*, 125, 13; and the *Wills*, 135, 136, 143, every word so printed is either a proper name, or else, of Greek or Latin extraction. Viz.: *Audit*, 4, 12; *Adonis*, *Hellens*, *Grecian*, 53, 5, 7, 8; *Statues*, 55, 5; . . . *Mars*, 55, 7; *Intrim*, 56, 9; *Alien*, 78, 3; *Eaves* apple, 93, 13; *Saturne*, 98, 4; *Satire*, 100, 11; *Philomell*, 102, 7; *Autumne*, 104, 5; *Abisme*, 112, 9; *Alcumie*, 114, 4; *Syren*, 119, 1; *Heriticke*, 124, 9; *Audite*, *Quietus*, 126, 11, 12; *Cupid*, *Dyans*, *Cupid*, 153, 1, 2, 14. These words, if other than proper names, were so printed then, as French words are so printed now, viz.: because they were but partially incorporated into the English language. This destroys the presumption of accident and creates a presumption of design. (p. 260.) Lee: It was the natural tendency to italicize unfamiliar or foreign words and names and to give them an initial capital in addition. But the printer of the sonnets usually went his own way without heed of law or custom. "Rose" is used 12 times: it is italicized once (1, 2); the names of other flowers are not italicized at all (cf. 25, 6; 94, 14; 98, 9; 99, 6). "Alchemy" (alcumie) is used twice: it is once italicized (114, 4) and once not (33, 4). "Audite" is used thrice, and is twice italicized. "Autumn" appears twice, and is once italicized: "spring," "summer," and "winter" are never thus distinguished. . . . The following words of like class to those italicized in the sonnets lack that mark of distinction: Orient (7, 1); Phœnix (19, 4); Muse (32, 10 et al. loc.); Ocean (64, 5); Epitaph (81, 1); Rhetorick (82, 10); Charter (87, 3); cryttick (112, 11); cherubines (114, 6); Phisitions (140, 8). (pp. 48–49.) Simpson: The word here is full of import. In the range of its associations it reaches from the meaning that must be given to it in much of the *Romaunt of the Rose* to the sublime conception of Dante in the 30th and 31st cantos of his *Paradiso*. The aspiration for the immortality of the "rose of beauty" is the root of love. (p. 47.) Fleay [at one time believed that there might be an allusion to the Rose theatre, and Sh.'s connection with it in 1593–96.] (*Macm. Mag.*, 31: 440.) Wyndham: "Beauty's Rose" stands here poetically for the *Idea* or Eternal Type of Beauty, or, at least, for the emblem of that idea. . . . It is used to this end with a capital, 67, 8, and, again with a capital, as the emblem of the friend, 109, 14. (p. 261.) [But why not with italics again, if the quarto was as carefully printed as Wyndham supposed? — Ed.] Creighton [compares this line with 95, 8, which he thinks proves that Sh. knew the friend by the name of Rose, and is able to connect the name with Pembroke's courtesy title of "lord Ros of Kendal."] (*Blackwood*, 169: 672 f.) Porter: A poetic emblem of flowering beauty. . . . This special meaning deserves the capital and italics.

4. Massey: An allusion to the early death of [Southampton's] father. (p. 55.)

5. **contracted.** Schmidt: Betrothed. [So Rolfe and Beeching; the former

cites *T.N.*, V, i, 268: "You would have been contracted to a maid." It is more than doubtful, however, whether an apter parallel is not to be found in *Haml.*, I, ii, 4: "Our whole kingdom to be contracted in one brow of woe." The context, at any rate, suggests the notion "confined within the operation of your own eyes." This is close to TYLER'S paraphrase: "Not having given extension to thyself in offspring." — ED.] **eyes.** TYLER: Mr. W. H.'s "bright eyes" are regarded as the central point or focus of his beauty.

6. **selfe substantiall.** DOWDEN: Fuel of the substance of the flame itself. WYNDHAM: Fuel of the same substance as thy "light's flame," viz.: thine eye-sight.

9–10. MASSEY: [Cf. the Dedication to *V. & A.*, where] the poet hopes that his young patron may answer to the "world's hopeful expectation." . . . In both we have Hope a-tiptoe at gaze on this new wonder of youth and beauty. (p. 48.) TYLER: Expressions suitable in the case of a youth but just eighteen [i.e., Pembroke].

10. **only.** SCHMIDT: Principal, chief. SHARP: Matchless, incomparable. BEECHING: The first bright flower of a new spring. The idea of the third quatrain seems to be that W. H. might, if he pleased, enrich the world with a more beautiful race of mortals.

12. *CAPELL: Cf. *R. & J.*, I, i, 223–26:

> Then she hath sworn that she will still live chaste?
> — She hath, and in that sparing makes huge waste;
> For beauty starv'd with her severity
> Cuts beauty off from all posterity.

tender chorle. [According to PERCY SIMPSON, a regular example of the vocative without commas; cf. *M.V.*, IV, i, 335 (Folio): "Now infidell I have thee on the hip," and many similar passages. (*Sh. Punctuation*, p. 21.)]

14. STEEVENS: I read (piteous constraint to read such stuff at all!), "To eat the world's due, *be thy* grave and thee;" i.e., be at once thyself, and thy grave. . . . I did not think the late Mr. Rich had such example for the contrivance of making Harlequin jump down his own throat. MALONE: Sh. considers the propagation of the species as "the world's due," as a right . . . which it may demand from every individual. . . . "If you do not fulfil this duty, acknowledge that, as a glutton swallows and consumes more than is sufficient for his own support, so you . . . consume and destroy 'the world's due'; to the desolation of which you will doubly contribute; 1. by thy death; 2. by thy dying childless." Our author's plays, as well as the poems now before us, affording a sufficient number of conceits, it is rather hard that he should be answerable for such as can only be obtained through the medium of alteration; that he should be ridiculed not only for what he has, but for what he has *not* written. **the grave and thee.** DOWDEN: By means of the grave (which will swallow your beauty — cf. S. 77, 6), and of yourself, who refuse to beget offspring. Cf. *A.W.*, I, i, 153: "Virginity . . . consumes itself to the very paring, and so dies with feeding his own stomach." WYNDHAM:

Your death, and your refusal to propagate your beauty. J. W. BRIGHT [would take "by" with "due": "due at the hands of" or "owed by." (*Mod. Lang. Notes*, 14: 186.)]

For a 17th century MS. version of lines 5–14, see notes under S. 2.

2

WHEN fortie Winters shall beseige thy brow,
And digge deep trenches in thy beauties field,
Thy youthes proud liuery so gaz'd on now,
Wil be a totter'd weed of smal worth held:
Then being askt, where all thy beautie lies,
Where all the treasure of thy lusty daies;
To say within thine owne deepe sunken eyes,
Were an all-eating shame, and thriftlesse praise.
How much more praise deseru'd thy beauties vse,
If thou couldst answere this faire child of mine
Shall sum my count, and make my old excuse
Prooving his beautie by succession thine.
This were to be new made when thou art ould,
And see thy blood warme when thou feel'st it could,

4. **totter'd**] *tatter'd* G, etc. (except Bull, Wa).
7. **within . . . eyes**] Italics by Co^3. **owne**] *one* S^1.
deepe sunken] Hyphened by G^2, etc. (except A).
10–11. **this . . . excuse**] Quoted by M, etc. (except Co^3, Hu^2); italics by Co^3, Hu^2.
11. **old**] *whole* Hazlitt, But.

---

1. **fortie winters.** SCHMIDT: Used for an indefinite number. [Besides the parallels cited by Schmidt, see Elze, to the same effect, *Jahrb.*, 11: 288.] BUTLER: [Since in it the poet views men of forty as old,] I hold that this sonnet can only have been written by one who was still very young. (p. 89.) ROLFE: Schmidt puts this passage among those in which "forty" is used for "an indefinite number" (as often); but the context shows that it has distinct reference to age. [This note I cannot understand; of course the phrase has reference to age, and of course to an indefinite age. — ED.] DOWDEN: Sh. fixes on so early an age as forty because, had he said fifty, it might have allowed time for his friend's son to pass beyond the point of youthful perfection to which Sh.'s friend has now attained. . . . Perhaps the forty years are counted from the *present age* of the young friend, bringing him thus to

about sixty years of age. . . . Krauss cites from Sidney's *Arcadia* two examples of " forty winters."

2. VON MAUNTZ: Cf. Ovid, *Med. Formæ*, 46: " Et placitus rugis vultus aratus erit; " and *Tristia*, III, vii, 33–34:

> Ista decens facies longis vitiabitur annis,
> Rugaque in antiqua fronte senilis erit.

4. **totter'd.** BULLEN: A recognised form of " tattered "; scores and scores of examples of it may be found, and I have not hesitated to restore it to the text.

7. **eyes.** PORTER: The eyes here, as in S. 1, 6, and often by the poet, are regarded as the house of the individual spirit of life.

8. **all-eating shame.** TYLER: Shame which consumes the person guilty of so shameful conduct, with his posterity. **thriftless.** DOWDEN: Unprofitable.

11. **sum my count,** etc. [Cf. 4, 12. — ED.] **my old excuse.** DELIUS: My excuse when I, or that I, am old. [So ROLFE.] DOWDEN: The excuse of my oldness. TYLER: The account will be . . . settled by his son, whose youthful beauty will furnish an excuse for Mr. W. H.'s oldness, or, perhaps, will furnish the old and customary excuse by proving that he has inherited the beauty of his father. BEECHING: Stand for the whole treasure of beauty committed to me (being indeed my own), and so make excuse for my age. WYNDHAM: *Old* may be a noun for " eld," as in 68, 12: " Robbing no old." [But this is no parallel, for in 68, 12 " old " means " old object," correlatively with " new " for " new object." — ED.] . . . In that case *excuse* is a participle for " excused." [The construction remains doubtful. The *N. E. D.*, though listing " old " with the meaning " old age," gives no clear example later than Middle English. — ED.]

Exceptional popularity in the 17th century seems to be indicated for this sonnet by the survival of a number of MS. copies. Some of these were described in *The Athenæum*, July 26, Aug. 2, and Sept. 6, 1913; pp. 89, 112, 230. One is in the British Museum, in Sloane MS. 1792, for a careful account of which I am indebted to Professor Charles W. Wallace. Dr. Wallace's conclusions are that the MS. is probably an exercise book of a student at Christ Church, with tutorial corrections, and dates from the Restoration period. The text of Sonnet 2 is as follows:

To one that would die a Mayd

When forty winters shall beseige thy brow
And trench deepe furrowes in that louely feild
Thy youth faire liuerie soe accounted now
Shall bee like like rotten weedes of noe worth heild
Then being ask't where all thy beauty lies
Where all the lustre of thy youthfull dayes
To say within thes hollow suncken eyes
Were an alleaten truth, and worthles pleasure.

How better were thy beauties use
If thou couldst say this prittie childe of mine
Saues my account and makes my old excuse
Making his beauty by succession thine
This were to bee new borne when thou art old
And see thy bloud warme, when thou feelst it cold.

A second copy, with the same title, appears in a commonplace book lately in the possession of Mr. Bertram Dobell, in company with other poems dating from the first half of the 16th century. The text follows:

To one that would dye a Mayd

When forty winters shall besiege thy brow,
And trench deepe furrowes in that lovely field
Thy youths fayre livery, so accounted now,
Shall be like rotten cloaths of no worth held.
Then being askt where all thy beauty lies
Where all the lustre of thy youthfull daies:
To say, within these hollow sunken eyes:
Were an all beaten Truth, and worthlesse prayse.
O how much better were thy beauties use
If thou couldst say, this pretty child of mine
Saves my account, and makes no old excuse
Making his beauty by succession thine!
This were to bee new borne, when thou art old
And see thy blood warme when thou feelst it could.

A third copy occurs in a MS. in the Library of St. John's College, Cambridge (MS. S. 23), together with extracts from Carew, Randolph, Davenant, and others. I am indebted to Mr. G. C. Macaulay for the following transcript and notes:

when fortie winters shall beseege the browe,
And dig deepe trenches in thy beauties field,
Thy youthes proude liuery so gazed on now
will be a tatterd weede, of small worth held.
Then beeing asked where all thy beautie lyes,
where all the treasure of thy lusty dayes
to say within thine owne deepe sonken eyes.
were an all eating shame and thriftlesse praise
how much more praise deserues thy beauties use.
If thou couldst say that this faire child of mine
Shall som my count and make thy ould excuse,
prouing his beautie by succession thine.
This were to be new made when thou art old.
And see thy blood warme, when thou feelst it cold.

W. Shakspere.

(The word "praise" in both l. 8 and l. 9 has the "se" written in a contemporary hand over something else which I cannot read. Also "use" in l. 9 is a correction apparently of "muse," and "old" in l. 13 probably of "ould.")

In still another MS. book, formerly in the possession of Mr. Dobell, but now in a private collection, there occurs a curious composite of the opening lines of the sonnet with the greater portion of Sonnet 1 and two lines from Sonnet 54. The following transcript is from a photograph made by Mr. Dobell:

Cruel

Thou Contracted to thine owne bright eys
Feedst thy light flame with selfe substantial fewell
Makeing a famine where aboundance lies
Thy selfe thy foe to thy sweet selfe too cruell.
Thou that art now the worlds fresh ornament
And onely herauld to ye Gaudy spring
Within thine owne Bud Buriest thy Contend
And tender Churle makes wast in niggarding
Pitty ye world or Els this Glutton bee
To Eat ye worlds due by ye world & thee
When forty winters shall bisiedg thy brow
And Dig deep trenches in thy beautyes field
Thy youths Proud liuery so gazd on now
Wil be A totterd weed of small worth held
The Canker bloomes haue ful as deepe a dy
As ye Perfumed tincture of ye roses.

In general it is obvious that none of these variant MSS. has any independent textual value; though the variants in the first quatrain, similar in the two versions first quoted, have been thought to give indications of a different early version of the sonnet. Mr. Dobell believed (*Ath.*, Aug. 2, 1913, p. 112) that this MS. version is that of "Sh.'s first draft of the sonnet."

3

Looke in thy glasse and tell the face thou vewest,
Now is the time that face should forme an other,
Whose fresh repaire if now thou not renewest,
Thou doo'st beguile the world, vnblesse some mother.
For where is she so faire whose vn-eard wombe
Disdaines the tillage of thy husbandry?
Or who is he so fond will be the tombe,
Of his selfe loue to stop posterity?
Thou art thy mothers glasse and she in thee
Calls backe the louely Aprill of her prime,
So thou through windowes of thine age shalt see,
Dispight of wrinkles this thy goulden time.
But if thou liue remembred not to be,
Die single and thine Image dies with thee.

3. **repaire**] *repaine* 1640.
8. **selfe loue**] Hyphened by L, G², E, etc.
12. **goulden**] *goulded* 1640.
13. **liue**] *love* C; *list* But. **remembred**] *remember* 1640, G, S, E.

---

4. **unblesse.** Schmidt: Neglect to make happy.

5. **un-eard.** Malone: Unploughed.

5–6. Regis: One of the instances where Sh., without knowing it, echoes the old poets. Cf. Sophocles, *Antigone*, 569: ["There are other fields that may be ploughed." Cf. also Æschylus, *Septem*, 754, "Who sowed in the field of the womb," etc.; and Sophocles, *Œdipus Tyrannus*, 260, 1211, 1257, 1485, 1497.]

6. Steevens: Cf. *M. for M.*, I, iv, 43–44:

Her plenteous womb
Expresseth his full tilth and husbandry.

7. **fond.** Schmidt: Foolish. Delius: Blindly in love with himself.

7–8. Malone: Cf. *R. & J.*, I, i, 225–26 [see under 1, 12], and *V. & A.*, 757–60:

What is thy body but a swallowing grave,
Seeming to bury that posterity
Which by the rights of time thou needs must have,
If thou destroy them not in dark obscurity?

8. **selfe love.** Tyler: Equivalent apparently to self-satisfaction.

9. MALONE: Cf. *Lucrece*, 1758–59:

> Poor broken glass, I often did behold
> In thy sweet semblance my old age new born.

mothers. DOWDEN: Were the father of Sh.'s friend living, it would have been natural to mention him; 13, 14 (" you had a father ") confirms our impression that he was dead. BEECHING: This word affords us no ground for the supposition that W. H.'s father was dead. The fact may simply have been that he resembled his mother. PORTER: Surely nothing of the sort either here or in S. 13 should bother any one's head. Here the mate whom the friend should take influences the mother imagery. There the heirship of his father's house influences the father imagery.

9–10. TYLER: As Professor Minto has well pointed out, [these lines] are entirely suited to the Countess of Pembroke. VON MAUNTZ: Cf. Sidney, *Arcadia*, Bk. 3: " What lesson is that unto you, but that in the april of your age, you should be like April? " [1590 ed., f. 280.]

11. MALONE: Cf. *L. C.*, 13–14:

> Spite of heaven's fell rage
> Some beauty peep'd through lattice of sear'd age.

13. TYLER: If your intention is to be forgotten. BEECHING: If you exist only for the sake of being forgotten.

4

VNTHRIFTY louelinesse why dost thou spend,
Vpon thy selfe thy beauties legacy?
Natures bequest giues nothing but doth lend,
And being franck she lends to those are free:
Then beautious nigard why doost thou abuse,
The bountious largesse giuen thee to giue?
Profitles vserer why doost thou vse
So great a summe of summes yet can'st not liue?
For hauing traffike with thy selfe alone,
Thou of thy selfe thy sweet selfe dost deceaue,
Then how when nature calls thee to be gone,
What acceptable *Audit* can'st thou leaue?
Thy vnus'd beauty must be tomb'd with thee,
Which vsed liues th'executor to be.

14. **th'executor**] *thy executor* C, M, A, B, But; *the executor* Del, Kly, R^2, N.

[ISAAC calls attention to resemblances between this sonnet and passages in Marlowe's *Hero & Leander* (234–36, 255–56, 317, 328):

> Treasure is abus'd
> When misers keep it; being put to loan,
> In time it will return us two for one . . .
> One is no number; maids are nothing, then,
> Without the sweet society of men . . .
> Abandon fruitless, cold virginity . . .
> Beauty alone is lost, too warily kept.

He concludes:] That Marlowe is here copying from Sh., rather than the reverse, may be inferred from the circumstance that he also draws upon *V. & A.* (*Jahrb.*, 19: 250.)

1–4. LEE: Cf. Guarini, *Pastor Fido* (I, i); . . . Fanshawe translates:

> Why did frank Nature upon thee bestow
> Blossoms of beauty in thy prime, so sweet
> And fair, for thee to trample under feet?

3. DOWDEN: Cf. *M. for M.*, I, i, 37–41:

> Nature never lends
> The smallest scruple of her excellence
> But, like a thrifty goddess, she determines
> Herself the glory of a creditor,
> Both thanks and use.

STEEVENS: Cf. Milton, *Comus*, 679–84:

> Why should you be so cruel to yourself,
> And to those dainty limbs which Nature lent
> For gentle usage and soft delicacy?
> But you invert the covenants of her trust,
> And harshly deal, like an ill borrower,
> With that which you receiv'd on other terms.

VERITY: Cf. Lucretius: "Vitaque mancipio nulli datur."

4. **franck.** SCHMIDT: Liberal. [*Free*, as often, is synonymous; see *N. E. D.* on "frank and free," etc. — ED.] **those are free.** [For the omission of the relative, see ABBOTT, Gr., § 244:] In many cases the antecedent immediately precedes the verb to which the relative would be the subject.

5–6. SARRAZIN: [Cf. Daniel, *Delia*, S. 37: "Here, see the gifts that God and Nature lent thee." (*Sh.'s Lehrjahre*, p. 172.)]

7. **Profitles userer.** TYLER: To beget posterity would be to put out to interest Nature's gift or trust. Using this for himself alone, Mr. W. H. is a "profitless usurer." [*Use* implies an allusion to the meaning "put to usury or interest." — ED.]

8. McClumpha: Cf. *R. & J.*, II, vi, 34: " I cannot sum up sum of half my wealth." (*Jahrb.*, 40: 197.)

12. **acceptable.** [Not used elsewhere by Sh., but there are familiar analogies for the accent, as *commendable* in " 'T is sweet and commendable in your nature, Hamlet." — Ed.]

[On the style of this sonnet, as marked by repetition of words, see Sarrazin in *Jahrb.*, 32: 150–54. He instances similar examples in Sonnets 6, 8, 13, 16, 28, 40, 43, 44, 128, 129, 136, 138, 142, and observes that the manner is confined to the opening " procreation " group and the " love sonnets "; further, that it is paralleled especially in *V. & A.*, *Lucrece*, *T. G. V.*, *R. & J.*, and *R. 3*.]

5

THose howers that with gentle worke did frame,
The louely gaze where euery eye doth dwell
Will play the tirants to the very same,
And that vnfaire which fairely doth excell:
For neuer resting time leads Summer on,
To hidious winter and confounds him there,
Sap checkt with frost and lustie leau's quite gon.
Beauty ore-snow'd and barenes euery where,
Then were not summers distillation left
A liquid prisoner pent in walls of glasse,
Beauties effect with beauty were bereft,
Nor it nor noe remembrance what it was.
But flowers distil'd though they with winter meete,
Leese but their show, their substance still liues sweet.

7. **Sap checkt**] Hyphened by Stee (Q reprint). **leau's**] *leaves* G, etc.
8. **barenes**] *barenness* G¹; *barrenness* G², S², E.
14. **Leese**] *Lose* G, S, E, B.

---

1. **howers.** Malone: " Hours " is almost always used by Sh. as a dissyllable.

2. **gaze.** Schmidt: Object eagerly looked on. [Cf. *Macb.*, V, viii, 24: " The show and gaze o' the time."]

4. **unfaire.** Abbott: It may be said that any noun or adjective could be converted into a verb by the Elizabethan authors, generally in an active signification. (§ 290.) Dowden: Cf. 127, 6: " Fairing the foul." [And cf. *A. & C.*, II, v, 64: " I 'll unhair thy head." — Ed.]

6. **confounds.** Schmidt: Destroys.

7. [The first of a number of beautiful examples in the Sonnets of what may be called spondaic lines; note the special effect of balanced cadences like " sap check'd " and "quite gone," comparing 27, 12; 30, 4; etc. — Ed.] **gon.** Porter: The poetic effect of the [period] after *gone* is lovely, and to be preferred. [It will be understood, without full reference to all notes of this character in the First Folio Edition, that Miss Porter is able to find a subtle beauty in most of the negligences of the quarto printer. — Ed.]

8. **barenes every where.** Malone: Cf. 97, 4.

9–14. Malone: This is a thought with which Sh. seems to have been much pleased. We find it again in S. 54, and in *M. N. D.*, I, i, 76–78:

> But earthlier happy is the rose distill'd,
> Than that which withering on the virgin thorn
> Grows, lives, and dies in single blessedness.

Massey: Cf. Sidney, *Arcadia*, Bk. iii: " Have you ever seen a pure rose-water kept in a crystal glass? How fine it looks! how sweet it smells while that beautiful glass imprisons it! Break the prison, and let the water take his own course, doth it not embrace dust, and lose all his former sweetness and fairness? Truly so are we, if we have not the stay rather than the restraint of crystalline marriage." [ed. 1590, f. 262.] Beeching: The expression here seems certainly to be Sidney's, though the argument in the *Arcadia* is entirely different. Lee: The identical illustration from the rose figures in Erasmus's colloquy, " Proci et Puellae." Walsh: This is a simile frequently used by Lilly: " Roses that lose their colours, keep their savours; plucked from the stalk, are put to the still." (*Sapho & Phao*, II, i.)

11. **Beauties effect.** Rolfe: The perfume which perpetuates the memory of the beauty.

14. **Leese.** [The only appearance in Sh. of this familiar variant of "lose." See the *N. E. D.* for the numerous earlier variant forms. — Ed.]

[For a mystical interpretation of the image of distillation, with alleged parallels in writings such as those of Philip of Mornay, see the eccentric article in *Blackwood*, 137: 774, especially p. 781 f.]

6

THEN let not winters wragged hand deface,
In thee thy summer ere thou be distil'd:
Make sweet some viall; treasure thou some place,
With beautits treasure ere it be selfe kil'd:
That vse is not forbidden vsery,
Which happies those that pay the willing lone;
That's for thy selfe to breed an other thee,
Or ten times happier be it ten for one,
Ten times thy selfe were happier then thou art,
If ten of thine ten times refigur'd thee,
Then what could death doe if thou should'st depart,
Leauing thee liuing in posterity?
Be not selfe-wild for thou art much too faire,
To be deaths conquest and make wormes thine heire.

1. **wragged**] *ragged* G, etc.; *rugged* C.

4. **beautits**] *beauties* 1640, L, G^1; *beauty's* G^2, etc. **selfe kil'd**] Hyphened by G, etc.

13. **selfe-wild**] *self-will'd* G, etc. (except But); *self-kill'd* Del conj., But.

---

1. **wragged.** SCHMIDT: Rough.

5–6. MASSEY: Cf. Sidney, *Arcadia:* "This [i.e., marriage and procreation] as it bindeth the receiver, so it makes happy the bestower. This doth not impoverish, but enrich the giver." [ed. 1590, f. 261 b.] (p. 72.) DOWDEN: Cf. *V. & A.*, 767–68:

> Foul-cank'ring rust the hidden treasure frets,
> But gold that 's put to use more gold begets.

And *M.V.*, I, iii, 70–97 [Shylock's remarks on usury].

5. **use.** MALONE: Usance. DOWDEN: Interest. [Cf. 134, 10. — ED.]

6. **happies.** See note on "unfair," 5, 4.

8. **one.** [PERCY SIMPSON instances the comma here as an example of its general use, in Elizabethan printing, where the connection of thought is emphasized by parallel clauses or echoed words. Cf. S. 9, 4–5. (*Sh. Punctuation*, pp. 18–19.)]

14. MCCLUMPHA: Cf. *R. & J.*, IV, v, 38: "Death is my son-in-law, Death is my heir." (*Jahrb.*, 40: 201.)

7

Loe in the Orient when the gracious light,
Lifts vp his burning head, each vnder eye
Doth homage to his new appearing sight,
Seruing with lookes his sacred maiesty,
And hauing climb'd the steepe vp heauenly hill,
Resembling strong youth in his middle age,
Yet mortall lookes adore his beauty still,
Attending on his goulden pilgrimage:
But when from high-most pich with wery car,
Like feeble age he reeleth from the day,
The eyes (fore dutious) now conuerted are
From his low tract and looke an other way:
So thou, thy selfe out-going in thy noon:
Vnlok'd on diest vnlesse thou get a sonne.

5. steepe vp] Hyphened by G, etc. (except But); *steep up-heavenly* Nicholson conj., But.
7. beauty still,] *beauty, still* Nicholson conj.
9. car] *care* 1640, G, S, E; *ear* L.
10–12. day . . . way] *way* . . . *day* Godwin conj.
11. fore] *'fore* G^2, S^2, etc. (except Dy, R); *fore-dutious* S^1.
12. tract] *track* G^2, S^2.
13. thou, thy selfe] *thou thyself*, Co^2.

Simpson: [This sonnet is] founded on the converse of a proverb. . . . "Men use to worship the rising sun." On the other hand, says Sh., men turn their backs on the setting sun, and the only way to retain their homage is to receive it in the person of a son and successor. (p. 48.)

1–4. Walsh: Cf. *L. L. L.*, IV, iii, 222–25:

> Like a rude and savage man of Inde
> At the first opening of the gorgeous east,
> Bows not his vassal head and strucken blind
> Kisses the base ground with obedient breast.

5. steepe up. Beeching: So in a Shakespearean sonnet in *The P.P.*: "Her stand she takes upon a steep-up hill" [No. ix; l. 121]. "Steep-down" occurs in *Oth.*, V, ii, 280. Porter: [The two words should not be hyphenated.] Both

equally qualify *hill*. . . . The reason for both words is obvious enough when it is realized that earthly hills do not curve up as the concave semi-arc of sky does which the sun is here imagined as climbing. . . . Sh.'s adjectives give us the image of the steep and up-rounding heavenly hill, as expressed by one who held to the Ptolemaic conception of the celestial spheres. [This explanation of the image seems to me to be sound; not so the inference as to punctuation. — ED.]

5–6. MALONE: Perhaps our author had the sacred writings in his thoughts: "In them hath he set a tabernacle for the sun, which cometh forth as a bridegroom out of his chamber, and rejoiceth as a giant to run his course." [*Ps.* 19: 4–5.]

7–8. MALONE: Cf. *R. & J.*, I, i, 125–26:

> Madam, an hour before the worshipp'd sun
> Peer'd forth the golden window of the east.

9. **high-most pich.** PORTER: It is not the sunset . . . or the verging towards the horizon . . . that is here imagined as inglorious, but this slack moment when, at *noon, out-going* from the zenith of attainment and the day by him created, he reels away. **wery.** ROLFE: Cf. *R. 3*, V, iii, 19: "The weary sun hath made a golden set."

10. DOWDEN: Cf. *R. & J.*, II, iii, 3:

> And flecked darkness like a drunkard reels
> From forth day's path.

11. **fore dutious.** [PERCY SIMPSON: For the brackets, employed with adjectives or adjective phrases following a noun, cf. 30, 5 and 80, 5 and 7. (*Sh. Punctuation*, pp. 91–92.)]

11–12. HENRY BROWN: Cf. *T. of A.*, I, ii, 150: "Men shut their doors against a setting sun."

13. BEECHING: Outgoing thyself-in-thy-noon, passing beyond thy meridian beauty. ROLFE: Not referring to death . . . but to the "decline of life," as we say. [PERCY SIMPSON notes the colon at the end of this line under its regular use for marking emphatic pauses; he admits, however, that here "the sense hardly seems to justify so strong a pause"! (pp. 67–69.)]

14. **get.** [Noting the regular use of this word as identical with "beget," the *N. E. D.* is in doubt whether it is "a shortening of the native compound verb or an assimilation of the adopted Scandinavian simple verb to the form of the compound."]

8

Mvsick to heare, why hear'st thou musick sadly,
Sweets with sweets warre not, ioy delights in ioy:
Why lou'st thou that which thou receaust not gladly,
Or else receau'st with pleasure thine annoy?
If the true concord of well tuned sounds,
By vnions married do offend thine eare,
They do but sweetly chide thee, who confounds
In singlenesse the parts that thou should'st beare:
Marke how one string sweet husband to an other,
Strikes each in each by mutuall ordering;
Resembling sier, and child, and happy mother,
Who all in one, one pleasing note do sing:
Whose speechlesse song being many, seeming one,
Sings this to thee thou single wilt proue none.

1. **heare,**] *ear*, M conj.; *hear?* But. **sadly,**] *sadly?* G, etc.
8. **beare**] *share* Sta conj.
9. **string**] *strain* Godwin conj.
14. **thou . . . none**] Quoted by M, A, Kt, B, Del, Hu[1], Dy, Sta, Cl, Gl, Kly, Wh[2], Cam, Do, R, Ty, Ox, Wy, But, Her, N, Bull, Wa; italics by Co[3], Hu[2], Be.

[With the general conceit of this sonnet Isaac compares Marlowe's *Hero & Leander*, 229–30:

Like untun'd golden strings all women are,
Which long time lie untouch'd, will harshly jar.

(See his remark on S. 4.)] Tyler: Cf. *Daiphantus*, by A. Sc. (1604):

Music is only sweet
When without discord. A consort makes a heaven.
The ear is ravished when true voices meet.
Odds, but in music, never makes things even,
In voices difference breeds a pleasant ditty.

The writer of *Daiphantus* may have seen S. 8 in MS., or the resemblance may be accidental.

1. **Musick to heare.** Malone: I have sometimes thought Sh. might have written, "Music to *ear*," i.e., thou whose every accent is music to the ear. Cf. *C. of E.*, II, ii, 116: "Never words were music to thine ear." Dowden: Cf.

M.V., V, i, 69: "I am never merry when I hear sweet music." TYLER: This may possibly mean that Mr. W. H. had no liking for music. . . . But is it not possible that the "music heard sadly" was the virginal playing of Sh.'s dark mistress (128)? The sadness may thus have been caused by the impression which her fascinating endowments had already produced on Mr. W. H.

7. **confounds.** ABBOTT: The relative (perhaps because it does not signify by inflection any agreement in number or person with its antecedent) frequently takes a singular verb, though the antecedent be plural, and the verb is often in the third person, though the antecedent be in the second or first. . . . [The present example] may also be explained by the northern inflection of *s* for *st* [see on 19, 5]. (§ 247.) [For the meaning, see 5, 6.]

9. **string.** GODWIN [reads "strain" because] the music is supposed to be vocal. (p. 84.)

9–12. SIMPSON: Founded on an acoustic phenomenon. . . . If two strings sound any two notes of the perfect triad in complete accord, the third note will be spontaneously produced in the air by a complementary vibration. (p. 49.) [In this explanation Simpson had been anticipated by Knight, in the *Pictorial Sh.* — ED.] MASSEY: Cf. Sidney, *Arcadia:* "Can one string make as good music as a consort?" [1590 ed., f. 262 b.] (p. 72.)

14. DOWDEN: Perhaps an allusion to the proverbial expression that one is no number. Cf. 136, 8. TYLER: Thou canst give forth no harmony, and must eventually cease altogether.

In a MS. miscellany in the British Museum (Add. MSS. 15226), made up of various 17th century pieces, and probably dating (according to Dr. C. W. Wallace) from the period of the Commonwealth, occurs the following version of this sonnet:

In laudem Musice et opprobrium
Contemptorij eiusdem.

1.

Musicke to heare why hearest thou musicke sadly
Sweets wth sweetes warre not, Joy delights in Joy
Why louest yu that wch thou receauest not gladly
or els receauest wth pleasure thine annoy

2.

Jf the true Concord of well timed Sounds
By Vnions maried doe offend thy eare
They doe but sweetlie chide thee, whoe confounds
Jn singlenes a parte, wch thou shouldst beare

3.

Marke howe one stringe, sweet husband to another
Strikes each on each, by mutuall orderinge

Resemblinge Childe, & Syer, and happy Mother
wch all in one this single note dothe singe
whose speechles songe beeinge many seeming one
Sings this to thee, Thou single, shalt pue none
W: Shakspeare.

9

Is it for feare to wet a widdowes eye,
That thou consum'st thy selfe in single life?
Ah; if thou issulesse shalt hap to die,
The world will waile thee like a makelesse wife,
The world wilbe thy widdow and still weepe,
That thou no forme of thee hast left behind,
When euery priuat widdow well may keepe,
By childrens eyes, her husbands shape in minde:
Looke what an vnthrift in the world doth spend
Shifts but his place, for still the world inioyes it
But beauties waste hath in the world an end,
And kept vnvsde the vser so destroyes it:
No loue toward others in that bosome sits
That on himselfe such murdrous shame commits.

1. Is it] *It is* 1640.
3. shalt] *shall* Wa. to] *do* E.
5. The . . . widdow] Quoted by E.
12. vser] *us'rer* S, E.
13. toward] *towards* G, S, E.
14. murdrous] *murtherous* Wh, R.

---

3. Ah. [PERCY SIMPSON notes that the semi-colon is often used with exclamations and addresses. (*Sh. Punctuation*, pp. 60–62.)]
4. makelesse. SCHMIDT: Makeless, widowed.
8. eyes. See Tyler's note on 1, 5.
9. unthrift. SCHMIDT: Prodigal. Cf. 13, 13.
10. his. On the neuter possessive, see ABBOTT, § 228, and FRANZ, § 189.
12. MCCLUMPHA: Cf. *R. & J.*, III, iii, 123–24:

> Which, like a usurer, abound'st in all,
> And usest none in that true use indeed. (*Jahrb.*, 40: 198.)

14. murdrous shame. SCHMIDT: [An example of the inversion or confusion of adjective and noun:] = shameful murder. (2: 1417.)

[From the accepted view that this sonnet refers to the possibility of the friend's making his wife a widow through his death, ISAAC dissents:] Of all grounds which could be urged against marriage, this, put into the mouth of a youth, is the most original. It seems to me more natural that *widow* refers to the mother of the friend, and that the passage is to be understood thus: Dost thou fear to sadden thy mother, of whose widowhood thou art the consolation and from whom marriage would separate thee? [This is applied to the mother of Essex, between the death of Leicester her second husband, Sept., 1588, and her marriage to Blount, July, 1589.] (*Jahrb.*, 19: 245.)

10

For shame deny that thou bear'st loue to any
Who for thy selfe art so vnprouident
Graunt if thou wilt, thou art belou'd of many,
But that thou none lou'st is most euident:
For thou art so possest with murdrous hate,
That gainst thy selfe thou stickst not to conspire,
Seeking that beautious roofe to ruinate
Which to repaire should be thy chiefe desire:
O change thy thought, that I may change my minde,
Shall hate be fairer log'd then gentle loue?
Be as thy presence is gracious and kind,
Or to thy selfe at least kind harted proue,
Make thee an other selfe for loue of me,
That beauty still may liue in thine or thee.

1. **shame**] *shame!* S, E, M, A, Kt, Co, B, Del, Hu, Dy, Cl, Gl, Kly, Wh, Hal, Cam, Do, R, Ty, Ox, Her, N; *shame*, Sta.

5. **murdrous**] *murtherous* Wh, R.

---

1. **For shame.** WYNDHAM: For shame's sake. [The punctuation "shame!"] destroys the rhythm. [The textual notes will show that, since Wyndham restored the quarto reading here, a number of editors have followed him. It is probable that they have done so on the ground that the line makes sense without the point of exclamation, rather than on the rhythmical ground mentioned by Wyndham; the latter argument is of a perilous sort, and can usually be made to work both ways. — ED.]

7. STEEVENS: Cf. *C. of E.*, III, ii, 4: "Shall love, in building, grow so ruinate?" (Folio reading), and *T. G. V.*, V, iv, 7–11:

O thou that dost inhabit in my breast,
Leave not the mansion so long tenantless,
Lest, growing ruinous, the building fall
And leave no memory of what it was!
Repair me with thy presence, Silvia!

MASSEY: Cf. Sidney, *Arcadia:*

O Histor, seek within thyself to flourish;
Thy house by thee must live, or else be gone. (pp. 73–74.)

DOWDEN: Seeking to bring ruin to that house (i.e., family), which it ought to be your chief care to repair. These lines confirm the conjecture that the father of Sh.'s friend was dead. TYLER: *Beauteous roof* [is] to be understood generally of the bodily house. BUTLER: Not his friend's family, nor yet his family mansion; . . . the flesh and blood roof of that particular tenement within which his friend's mind was housed. [Cf. 13, 9–14.] (p. 53.) BEECHING: Dowden and Herford explain "house, i.e., family." But this is impossible. Sh. regards the perpetuation of his friend's beauty in an heir as a preserving of it from decay. The "beauteous roof" . . . is the person of his friend.

12. **kind.** PORTER: The adjective applies in a special sense, *kind* being suggestive of "kin" and "child."

14. TYLER: Cf. *V. & A.*, 173–74:

And so, in spite of death, thou dost survive,
In that thy likeness still is left alive.

11

As fast as thou shalt wane so fast thou grow'st,
In one of thine, from that which thou departest,
And that fresh bloud which yongly thou bestow'st,
Thou maist call thine, when thou from youth conuertest,
Herein liues wisdome, beauty, and increase,
Without this follie, age, and cold decay,
If all were minded so, the times should cease,
And threescoore yeare would make the world away
Let those whom nature hath not made for store,
Harsh, featurelesse, and rude, barrenly perrish,
Looke whom she best indow'd, she gaue the more;
Which bountious guift thou shouldst in bounty cherrish,
She caru'd thee for her seale, and ment therby,
Thou shouldst print more, not let that coppy die.

6. **this**] *this*, G², etc. (except Kt).

8. **yeare**] *years* G, S, E, C, M, A, Kt, B, Hu¹, Kly, Ty, But.

11. **Looke**] *Thou* Sharp conj. **the**] *thee* S¹, C, M, A, B, Del, Co², Sta, Hu², But, Be, Wa.

14. **not**] *nor* M, A, Kt, B, Hu¹, Sta, Kly, Ty, Ox.

1–2. TYLER: In his child [he grows] towards, or in, that youthful beauty which he is leaving behind. WYNDHAM: I retain the comma after *grow'st*, as in Q, and remove the comma after *thine*, to make clearer the only meaning which I can extract: So fast thou grow'st, in one of thy children deriving from that (the period of youth) which thou departest (leavest behind). ROLFE: If you have children, as fast as you grow old you renew in your offspring the youth you have lost; thus, as it were, *growing* afresh *from that* (youth) *which thou departest* from. The omission of a preposition is common in a relative clause if it occurs in the antecedent clause. Possibly *departest* may be transitive. DOWDEN: *Departest* = leavest. [So SCHMIDT.] BEECHING: Separatest off. . . . "That which thou departest," a slip of thee.

3. **yongly.** WYNDHAM: In youth.

4. **convertest.** [For the intransitive use, cf. *Macb.*, IV, iii, 229: "Let grief convert to anger." For the rhyme cf. *art: convert* in S. 14. — ED.]

7. **the times.** DOWDEN: The generations of men.

7–8. VON MAUNTZ: Cf. Ovid, *Amores*, II, xiv, 9–10:

> Si mos antiquis placuisset matribus idem,
> Gens hominum vitio deperitura fuit.

9. **store.** SCHMIDT: Increase of men, fertility. HERFORD: *For store* = to breed from. "Store" is properly breeding-stock. [Cf. 14, 12. — ED.]

11. **the more.** MALONE: [The Q reading is evidently a misprint.] Nature, however liberal she may have been to others, has been still more bountiful to you. [The tendency of recent editors, however, as the textual notes indicate, has been to retain the Q reading. — ED.] DOWDEN: To whom she gave much she gave more. ROLFE: Cf. *Matt.*, 13: 12: "Whosoever hath, to him shall be given, and he shall have more abundantly." [But this is much easier to understand than the statement that more is given to one who already has *most*. Hence, no doubt, the suggestion that follows. — ED.] TYLER: "The more" = the more important or greater gift, the function of reproducing their kind. [Cf. "more" in 23, 12 and 40, 4.]

13–14. MALONE: Cf. *T.N.*, I, v, 259–61:

> Lady, you are the cruell'st she alive,
> If you will lead these graces to the grave
> And leave the world no copy.

HENRY BROWN: Cf. Massinger, *The Fatal Dowry:*

> Die, and rob
> The world of nature's copy, that she works
> Forms by. (p. 167.)

12

When I doe count the clock that tels the time,
And see the braue day sunck in hidious night,
When I behold the violet past prime,
And sable curls or siluer'd ore with white:
When lofty trees I see barren of leaues,
Which erst from heat did canopie the herd
And Sommers greene all girded vp in sheaues
Borne on the beare with white and bristly beard:
Then of thy beauty do I question make
That thou among the wastes of time must goe,
Since sweets and beauties do them-selues forsake,
And die as fast as they see others grow,
And nothing gainst Times sieth can make defence
Saue breed to braue him, when he takes thee hence.

4. **And**] *In* C. **or**] *are* G^2, S, E; *all* M, etc. *o'er silvered with* anon. conj.; *o'er silver'd all with* Nicholson conj.

DOWDEN: This sonnet seems to be a gathering into one of 5, 6, 7.

3. DOWDEN: Cf. *Haml.*, I, iii, 7: " A violet in the youth of primy nature."
4. STEEVENS: Cf. *Haml.*, I, ii, 242: " A sable silver'd."
7–8. *CAPELL: Cf. *M. N. D.*, II, i, 94–95:

> The green corn
> Hath rotted ere his youth attain'd a beard.

TYLER: The pessimistic tendency which emerges in the expression [" hideous night "] becomes still more apparent when harvest-home is transmuted into a funeral, and the waggon laden with ripened corn becomes a *bier* bearing the aged dead.

9. **question.** SCHMIDT: Discussion, consideration. TYLER: "Question make" = feel a doubt whether it will not be, etc.

10. **wastes of time.** [Editions differ here, as elsewhere, in the matter of treating " time " as a personification and capitalizing it. To do so in this instance would seem to be supported not only by line 13, but by *R. 2*, V, v, 49: " I wasted time, and now doth Time waste me." — ED.]

14. MALONE: Except children, whose youth may set the scythe of Time at defiance. GODWIN: The word " breed " . . . is not used in the usual sense of the engendered, but in a more derivative sense, inasmuch as the instances adduced are taken from the vegetal world, where it has the significance given it when we say that " use breeds habit," that " money breeds interest," that " public means do public manners breed." (p. 74.) [This is a part of Godwin's esoteric interpretation of the sonnets, which in general I do not attempt to represent in these notes. — ED.] **him.** PERCY SIMPSON: [The comma after this word is a beautiful and suggestive instance of its use for a metrical pause:] the alliteration of " breed " and " brave " carries on the line to the pause where the voice seems to falter at the thought of the final parting. The passage is ruined by the modern punctuation, " Save breed, to brave him when he takes thee hence." (*Sh. Punctuation*, p. 24.)

13

O THAT you were your selfe, but loue you are
No longer yours, then you your selfe here liue,
Against this cumming end you should prepare,
And your sweet semblance to some other giue.
So should that beauty which you hold in lease
Find no determination, then you were
You selfe again after your selfes decease,
When your sweet issue.your sweet forme should beare.
Who lets so faire a house fall to decay, 9
Which husbandry in honour might vphold,
Against the stormy gusts of winters day
And barren rage of deaths eternall cold?
O none but vnthrifts, deare my loue you know,
You had a Father, let your Son say so.

7. **You**] *Your* 1640, G, etc.
13. **deare**] *dare* 1640.

DOWDEN: Note "you" and "your" instead of "thee," "thine," and the address "my love" for the first time. [The different uses of these pronouns were first discussed, for the Sonnets, by Goedeke, *Deutsche Rundschau*, 1877; later by Dowden, in his edition; and have been made the starting-point of various interesting discussions, none of which can be said to have reached any result. Dowden's own summary of the facts is as follows: "Sometimes the choice seems to be determined by considerations of euphony, sometimes of rhyme; sometimes intimate affection seems to indicate the use of *you*, and respectful homage that of *thou;* but this is by no means invariable. . . . In the sonnets to a mistress, *thou* is invariably employed." (Intro., p. 25.) This last statement covers only, in Dowden's view, the sonnets 127 and following. The *thou-thy* sonnets are 1–4, 6–12, 14, 18, 20, 22, 26–32, 34–51, 60–62, 69–70, 73–74, 77–79, 82, 87–93, 95–97, 99, 107–10, 122, 125–26, 128, 131–36, 139–43, 147–52. The *you-your* sonnets are 13, 15–17, 52–55, 57–59, 71–72, 75–76, 80–81, 83–86, 98, 102–104, 106, 111–15, 117–18, 120. S. 24 contains both forms. — ED.]

1. DOWDEN: *Yourself* seems to mean "your own." TYLER: Cf. "another self," 10, 13; "next self," 133, 6. [Tyler also, and rightly, calls attention to the necessity of printing "your self" as two words. — ED.] VERITY: Would that you were absolute, independent of time, free from the conditions that

fetter men. GODWIN: [Verity's note expresses] just the reverse of what the poet wishes, i.e., that his friend should know his dependence upon his conditions. . . . [The meaning is:] Oh, that you were master of yourself and knew that you are your own only so long as this present life continues. (p. 81.)

3–4. MALONE: Cf. *V. & A.*, 171–74 [see under S. 1].

5–6. MALONE: Cf. Daniel, *Delia:*

> In beauty's lease expir'd appears
> The date of age, the calends of our death.

. . . *Determination* in legal language means "end." HAZLITT: "Find no determination" = become a fee-simple. LORD CAMPBELL: The word is always used by lawyers instead of end. (*Sh.'s Legal Acquirements*, p. 101.)

8. MASSEY: Cf. Sidney, *Arcadia:* "O the comfort of comforts, to see your children grow up, in whom you are, as it were, eternised! If you could conceive what a heart-tickling joy it is to see your own little ones . . . like little models of yourself still carry you about them, you would think unkindness in your own thoughts, that ever they did rebel against the mean unto it." [1590 ed., ff. 261–62.] (p. 72.)

9. **house.** TYLER: Must be referred to Mr. W. H.'s ancestry, not to the bodily house. [With this ROLFE agrees, distinguishing the passage from 10, 7. But BEECHING is, I think, undoubtedly right, in identifying the "house" with the "beauteous roof" of S. 10; and lines 11–12 make it even clearer than in the earlier sonnet that the passage has figurative reference to the individual life. — ED.] MASSEY: Southampton being an only son left fatherless, he was the sole prop and stay of the ancestral roof. (p. 55.)

10. **husbandry.** MALONE: Economical prudence. Cf. *H. 5*, IV, i, 7:

> For our bad neighbour makes us early stirrers,
> Which is both healthful and good husbandry.

12. **barren.** ABBOTT: Adjectives signifying effect were often used to signify the cause. (§ 4.)

14. **had a Father.** MASSEY: Cf. Sidney, *Arcadia:* "Nature . . . as she made you child of a mother, so to do your best to be mother of a child." [1590 ed., f. 261 b.] (p. 72.) [And] cf. *A.W.*, I, i, 19–20: "This young gentlewoman [Massey misreads "gentleman"] had a father, — O, that 'had'! how sad a passage 'tis!" (p. 55.) DOWDEN: The father of Sh.'s friend was probably dead. TYLER: Not that Mr. W. H.'s father was dead, but that he should do as his father did. . . . Cf. *M. W. W.*, III, iv, 36, where Shallow, urging Slender to woo Anne Page in manly fashion, . . . says, "She's coming, to her, coz. O boy, thou hadst a father." . . . Also *M.V.*, II, ii, 17–19, where Launcelot says, "My father *did* something smack." . . . To these passages my attention was directed by the Rev. W. A. Harrison. SARRAZIN: [The passage indicates beyond question that the youth's father was dead.] (*Jahrb.*, 31: 218.) WYNDHAM: Simply another poetical turn for the advice, "beget a son." It does not mean that the friend's father was dead. PORTER: The past tense should not be taken literally, but as

the naturally resulting contrast between the son's birth in the past and the grandson's in the future. BEECHING: Languet writing to Philip Sidney in praise of marriage tells the story from Herodotus (iii, 34) of Crœsus deciding that Cambyses' father Cyrus was the better of the two because he was the father of an admirable prince, whereas Cambyses had himself no son. (*Correspondence of Sidney & Languet*, trans. Pears, p. 148.)

14

Not from the stars do I my iudgement plucke,
And yet me thinkes I haue Astronomy,
But not to tell of good, or euil lucke,
Of plagues, of dearths, or seasons quallity,
Nor can I fortune to breefe mynuits tell;
Pointing to each his thunder, raine and winde,
Or say with Princes if it shal go wel
By oft predict that I in heauen finde.
But from thine eies my knowledge I deriue,
And constant stars in them I read such art
As truth and beautie shal together thriue
If from thy selfe, to store thou wouldst conuert:
Or else of thee this I prognosticate,
Thy end is Truthes and Beauties doome and date.

4. seasons] *seasons'* C, M, Co, B, Hu, Dy, Sta, Gl, Wh, Hal, Del[3], Cam, Do, R, Ox, Wy, But, Her, Be, N, Bull, Wa; *season's* A, Kt, Del[1,2], Cl, Kly, Ty.

6. Pointing] '*Pointing* Walker conj., Sta, Hu[2], N.

8. oft predict] *ought predict* G[2], S[2], E; hyphened by Kly.

11–12. truth . . . conuert] Quoted by Do, Ox.

14. Thy . . . date] Quoted by Do, Ox.

MASSEY: [With this sonnet the borrowings from Sidney's *Astrophel & Stella*, as distinguished from the *Arcadia*, begin. Cf. the passage on astrology here with Sidney's S. 26, etc. This suggests that Sonnets 1–13,] at least, were written immediately after Sh. had read the *Arcadia* in 1590, and before he had seen the *A. & S.* in 1591. (p. 74.)

2. **Astronomy.** SCHMIDT: Astrology. [The only use of the word in Sh.] DOWDEN: So Sidney, *Arcadia*, Bk. iii, "O sweet Philoclea, . . . thy heavenly face is my astronomy," and *A. & S.*, S. 26:

Though dusty wits dare scorn astrology . . .
[I] oft forejudge my after-following race
By only those two stars in Stella's face.

So Daniel, *Delia*, S. 30 (on Delia's eyes):

Stars are they sure, whose motions rule desires;
And calm and tempest follow their aspects.

3. **good.** [The comma here exemplifies a rule formulated by PERCY SIMPSON, with reference to the use of the comma before "or" and "nor" (also before "not"), with no comma after. Cf. *Oth.*, I, ii, 4: "Nine, or ten times." (*Sh. Punctuation*, p. 48.)]

4. FLEAY: The conjunction of [the terms "plagues," "dearths," etc.] seems to point to the plagues of 1592 and 1593, succeeded by the dearths of 1594, 1595, 1596, and the irregularity of the seasons in 1595, 1596. [Hence 1595–96 is a probable date for the sonnet.] (*Biog. Chronicle*, 2: 211.)

6. **Pointing.** *N. E. D.*: [The word is an] aphetic form of "appoint." ROLFE: Cf. Bacon, Essay 45 (ed. 1625): "But this to be, if you do not point any of the lower rooms for a dining place of servants."

8. **oft predict.** STEEVENS: May mean, "what is most frequently prognosticated." MALONE [in support of the text cites "the oft report" from *The Birth of Merlin*, 1662]. DOWDEN: Frequent prognostication. BUTLER: [For "predict," cf. "affect" for "affection" in *L. L. L.*, I, i, 152.] BEECHING: "Prediction" is used for "omen" in *J.C.*, II, ii, 28: "These predictions are to the world in general as to Cæsar."

9. STEEVENS: Cf. *L. L. L.*, IV, iii, 350: "From women's eyes this doctrine I derive."

10. **constant stars.** [For the punctuation, see PERCY SIMPSON'S statement that the omission of commas is regular with appositional phrases. (*Sh. Punctuation*, p. 23.)] **art.** SCHMIDT: Learning. [Cf. 66, 9, and contrast various other passages, as 68, 14, where the word is used with a suggestion of evil. — ED.]

12. MALONE: If thou wouldst change thy single state, and beget a numerous progeny. **store.** See 11, 9. **convert.** DOWDEN: Rhyming with "art"; so in Daniel, *Delia*, S. 11, "convert" rhymes with "heart." [Cf. 11, 4. — ED.]

15

When I consider euery thing that growes
Holds in perfection but a little moment.
That this huge stage presenteth nought but showes
Whereon the Stars in secret influence comment.
When I perceiue that men as plants increase,
Cheared and checkt euen by the selfe-same skie:
Vaunt in their youthfull sap, at height decrease,
And were their braue state out of memory.
Then the conceit of this inconstant stay,
Sets you most rich in youth before my sight,
Where wastfull time debateth with decay
To change your day of youth to sullied night,
And all in war with Time for loue of you
As he takes from you, I ingraft you new.

3. stage] *state* M, A, B.
6. euen] *ev'n* G², S², E.
8. were] *wear* G, etc.
14. you new] *anew* Sharp conj.

PORTER: Cf. Spenser, *Amoretti*, S. 24:

> When I behold that beauty's wonderment,
> And rare perfection of each goodly part,
> Of nature's skill the only complement,
> I honour and admire the Maker's art.
> But when I feel the bitter, baleful smart
> Which her fair eyes unwares do work in me, [etc.]

3. TYLER: Cf. *A. Y. L.*, II, vii, 139: "All the world 's a stage," etc.; *M.V.*, I, i, 77: "I hold the world but as . . . a stage where every man must play a part"; *Temp.*, IV, i, 153: "The great globe itself, yea, all which it inherit, shall dissolve," etc. [MALONE'S change of "stage" to "state," without comment, is unwarranted, and unlike him. — ED.]

4. DELIUS: The influence of the stars furnishes the only explanation of the play on the stage of the world. TYLER: As the annotation of a commentator runs parallel with the text, so the influence of the stars corresponds with the course of things in the world. BEECHING: The stars are represented as spectators at the play, "cheering and checking." *Influence* was an astrological term;

cf. *Lear*, I, ii, 136: "Drunkards, liars, and adulterers by an enforc'd obedience of planetary influence." *N. E. D.* (s. v. "influence"): The supposed flowing or streaming from the stars or heavens of an etherial fluid acting upon the character and destiny of men, and affecting sublunary things generally. [The difficulty with the passage, which has rather oddly escaped careful discussion, is that the notions "influence" and "comment" seem to be opposed, — the one suggesting the traditional active energy of the stars, the other the attitude of mere spectators. It is possible that we are to understand "influence" in a less active sense, and to think of the emanations of the planets, for the time being, as having only the nature of comment; but I think it more probable from the context, which emphasizes the destructive character of the various forces acting against all earthly growth, that the line means something like this: "which the stars view with disfavor and against which they secretly begin adverse action." The "comment," in other words, may be viewed as not that of a mere spectator, but of an author or manager who has power to change what he disapproves. The *N. E. D.* notes that the word often implies unfavorable judgment. — ED.]

6. **checkt.** SCHMIDT: Repressed.

7. **Vaunt.** SCHMIDT: Exult. TYLER: Mount proudly upward. Cf. *T. & C.*, Prol., 27, "Our play leaps o'er the vaunt and firstlings of those broils," where *vaunt* must mean the beginning and early course.

9. **conceit.** SCHMIDT: Idea, image in the mind. **stay.** [LEE: The word is from Golding's Ovid, where it is frequently used in connection with the theory of Nature's unending rotation. Thus, "The elements never stand at stay," etc. (*Qu. Rev.*, 210: 474.)]

11. **debateth.** MALONE: Cf. *A.W.*, I, ii, 75: "Nature and sickness debate it at their leisure." BEECHING: Time and Decay are allies in this "debate" or strife.

12. STEEVENS: Cf. *R. 3*, IV, iv, 16: "Hath dimm'd your infant morn to aged night."

13. [This line might be said to state the theme of a large part of the sonnet collection. — ED.]

14. WALSH: The idea of one thing growing as another wanes (and so replacing and preserving it) frequently recurs in the Sonnets (12, 12; 11, 1–2; 100, 13). **I ingraft.** BEECHING: The first reference to the poet's verse.

PRICE: [In this sonnet Sh.] arranges 112 words in one single sentence. (p. 369.)

16

BVT wherefore do not you a mightier waie
Make warre vppon this bloudie tirant time?
And fortifie your selfe in your decay
With meanes more blessed then my barren rime?
Now stand you on the top of happie houres,
And many maiden gardens yet vnset,
With vertuous wish would beare your liuing flowers,
Much liker then your painted counterfeit:
So should the lines of life that life repaire
Which this (Times pensel or my pupill pen)
Neither in inward worth nor outward faire
Can make you liue your selfe in eies of men,
To giue away your selfe, keeps your selfe still,
And you must liue drawne by your owne sweet skill,

6. **maiden gardens**] Hyphened by Kly.

7. **your**] *you* L, G, S, E, M, A, B, Hu², Ty, Ox, But, Be, Wa.

9. **lines**] *lives* M conj.; *line* Hu².

10. **Which**] *With* Stengel conj. **this (Times . . . pen)**] *this time's pencil, or my pupil pen*, G², Massey conj., Hu², Be, Wa; *this, Time's pencil, or my pupil pen*, M, A, Kt, Co, B, Del, Hu¹, Dy, Sta, Cl, Gl, Wh, Hal, Cam, Do, Ox, Her, N, Bull; *this (time's pencil), or my pupil pen*, E; *this, Time's pencil or my pupil-pen*, Kly; *this time's pencil or my pupil pen*, R.; *this time's pencil, nor my pupil pen*, But. **or**] *for* Stengel conj.

---

2. **tirant.** TYLER: Cf. 5, 3.

6. MALONE: Cf. *L.C.*, 171: "His plants in others' orchards grew."

7. DOWDEN: [In defense of the text, it may be said that] "your living flowers" stands over against "your painted counterfeit." [So ROLFE; but BEECHING feels that] to repeat "your" forces the antithesis too much.

8. **counterfeit.** [Illustrating the regular use of this word for "portrait," MALONE cites *M.V.*, III, ii, 116: "What find I here? Fair Portia's counterfeit?"] LEE: The many references [of this character; cf. S. 24, 27, 67] suggest that [Sh.'s] hero often sat for his portrait. Southampton's countenance survives in probably more canvases than that of any of his contemporaries. At least 14 extant portraits have been identified. . . . Most of these, it is true, portray their subject in middle age. (*Life*, p. 144.) PORTER: Any portrayal of life by art, whether literary or pictorial. . . . The poem or "barren rime" of

the poet is here called with belittlement a mere "painted counterfeit" in comparison with "living flowers."

9. **lines of life.** MALONE: This appears to me obscure. Perhaps the poet wrote, "the *lives* of life," i.e. children. [Later Malone approved as very plausible an anonymous suggestion that the phrase is equivalent to "living pictures," viz., children.] DOWDEN: Children. The unusual expression is selected because it suits the imagery of the sonnet, lines applying to (1) lineage, (2) delineation with a pencil, a portrait, (3) lines of verse as in 18, 12. TYLER: I was inclined to take these words as referring to the wrinkles on the brow of advancing life (cf. 19, 10) . . . But, having regard to the general drift of the sonnet, . . . I now assent to the interpretation of the "lines of life" as children in whom Mr. W. H. is supposed to have himself portrayed his mental and bodily excellences. [Cf. line 14.] WYNDHAM: I believe that the conceit, while including [the meanings noted by Dowden and others,] starts from a fourth drawn from palmistry, and that this determined its unusual cast, — *lines of life*. . . . Cf. *M.V.*, II, ii, 169: "Here 's a simple line of life: here 's a small trifle of wives," etc. Thus the sense is: Many a maid, if you should marry, would bear you "living flowers" = children, much liker than any portrait of yourself; so should the lines of life = marriage and procreation, with a play on the meaning *delineation*, repair that life of yours, which this = my record, with a play on the meaning *lines of verse* — and then in parentheses ("Times pensel" = history, record at large, "or my pupill pen" = my humbler art); "neither in inward worth nor outward fair" = beauty, can (do, for it cannot) make you live your self (i.e. very self) in eyes of men. [After several attempts to mitigate the difficulties in punctuation and phrasing which make this explanation at least as puzzling as the original, I have determined to let the reader learn from it what he can. — ED.] . . . The play on the double sense line = delineation, and line = a verse is developed in 17, 1–2; [cf. 63, 13; 86, 13; 17, 13–14; 18, 12. And cf. *W.T.*, I, ii, 153: "Looking on the lines of my boy's face," etc.] KINNEAR: So should the lines of life (your decay) that life (living children) repair, which this (this life, which, i.e., children's life which), nor Time's pencil, etc. (p. 497.) PORTER: In this way should the "lines of life," i.e., the lines of propagation, impregnation and conception, "repaire that life" — the actual life of the beloved; *which* life this counterfeit life ("Times pensel" etc.) can neither in its inward worth nor outward fairness cause you to embody and enact. HENRY BROWN: Cf. Hugh Holland, on Sh.:

> For though his line of life went soon about,
> The life yet of his lines shall never out. (p. 167.)

10. MASSEY: What Sh. says is, that the best painter, the master pencil of the time, or his own pen of a learner, will alike fail to draw the Earl's lines of life as he himself can do it, by his "own sweet skill." This pencil of the time may have been Mirevelt's; he painted [Southampton's] portrait in early manhood. (p. 83.) DOWDEN: Are we to understand the line as meaning "Which this pencil of Time or this my pupil pen"; and is Time here conceived as a limner who

has painted the youth so fair, but whose work cannot last for future generations? In 19 "devouring Time" is transformed into a scribe; may not "tyrant Time" be transformed here into a painter? . . . Is the "painted counterfeit" of line 8 Sh.'s portrayal in his verse? Cf. 53, 5. TYLER: Dr. Furnivall has suggested that this expression is used generally of such written records of the time as may refer to Mr. W. H. This view seems to me correct; and it is well worthy of note that in the Quarto . . . the words "Time's pencil or my pupil pen" are bracketed together. The record of "Time's pencil" would thus be of a similar kind to that made by the poet's "pupil pen." A reason may also thus be assigned for the use of the word "pupil," as implying that the record in these sonnets was subordinate to the general record or chronicle of the period. "This" . . . may be taken as meaning "any written record of this kind." HERFORD: The semblance of the man at any moment is conceived as his portrait, drawn by Time. But Time continually alters, and finally spoils, his work; hence "Time's pencil" is no remedy against decay. BEECHING: [The rhythm which results from a mark of punctuation after "this" is incredible.] "Neither portraiture (this time's pencil, cf. line 8) nor description (my pupil pen, cf. line 4) can represent you as you are, either in character or beauty." [For the rhythmical argument, cf. Wyndham's note on 10, 1. Are we to understand that these writers view with suspicion a considerable metrical pause after the second syllable? If so, what of 22, 10; 25, 3; 37, 3; 44, 9; 61, 9; 83, 3; 87, 1; 99, 2; 116, 5; 148, 1? — ED.] STEEVENS: [The words "pupil pen"] may be considered as a slight proof that the poems before us were our author's earliest compositions. [BUTLER (p. 90) approves this suggestion.] ARCHER: One of the expressions of exaggerated humility with which the Sonnets abound. (*Fort. Rev.*, 62: 821.) WALSH: Not necessarily inexperienced, but obedient to nature's instructions, copyist of reality (opposed to the "antique" or original and master-pen of nature). PORTER: Sh. speaks modestly of his "pupil pen" in comparison with "Time's pencil."

11. MCCLUMPHA: Cf. *R. & J.*, I, iii, 90: "For fair without the fair within to hide." (*Jahrb.*, 40: 193.) [For "fair" as a substantive, cf. 18, 7, 10; 83, 2. — ED.]

13. MALONE: To produce likenesses of yourself . . . will be the means of preserving your memory.

14. MASSEY: Cf. Sidney, *Arcadia:* "With his sweet skill my skilless youth he drew." (p. 74.)

17

Who will beleeue my verse in time to come
If it were fild with your most high deserts?
Though yet heauen knowes it is but as a tombe
Which hides your life, and shewes not halfe your parts:
If I could write the beauty of your eyes,
And in fresh numbers number all your graces,
The age to come would say this Poet lies,
Such heauenly touches nere toucht earthly faces.
So should my papers (yellowed with their age)
Be scorn'd, like old men of lesse truth then tongue,
And your true rights be termd a Poets rage,
And stretched miter of an Antique song.
But were some childe of yours aliue that time,
You should liue twise in it, and in my rime.

7–8. **this . . . faces**] Quoted by Co[1,2], Del, Hu[1], Dy, Sta, Cl, Gl, Wh, etc.; italics by Co[3], Hu[2].

12. **miter**] *metre* G, etc. **Antique**] *antick* G, S, E.

14. **twise in it**] *twice; in it* M, A, Kt, B, Gl, Wh[2], Wy, But; *twice; — in it* Sta, Kly; *twice, in it* Cam, Do, Her, Be, N, Bull, Wa; *twice, — in it* C, Hu, Dy, Cl, Del[3], R, Ty, Ox; *twice — in it* Co, Del[1,2], Wh[1], Hal.

5–8. Fleay: Cf. Drayton, *Idea*, S. 17:

> Stay, speedy Time! behold, before thou pass
> From age to age, what thou hast sought to see! . . .
> Pass on! and to posterity tell this!
> Yet see thou tell but truly what hath been!
> Say to our nephews that thou once hast seen
> In perfect human shape all heavenly bliss!
> And bid them mourn, nay more, despair with thee,
> (That she is gone) her like again to see!
>
> (*Biog. Chron.*, 2: 228.)

6. **fresh.** Beeching: "Lively and beautiful" to match the friend's "graces." See Sonnets 1, 9; 104, 8; 107, 10.

11. **rage.** Schmidt: Madness; applied, in contempt, to poetical inspiration.

12. Dowden: Keats prefixed this line as motto to his *Endymion*. "Stretched metre" means overstrained poetry. **stretched miter.** Schmidt: Affected, ex-

aggerated verse. PORTER: Forced metre, . . . characteristic of ballads and old-time verse. . . . This expression is commonly explained to mean "inflated" or "overstrained" poetry. It is rather a poetic figure of speech for that, but especially suggesting that in the future indulgence will be shown it as something archaic in verse. [Cf. *1 H. 4*, III, i, 130: "One of these same metre ballad-mongers." — ED.]

18

SHALL I compare thee to a Summers day?
Thou art more louely and more temperate:
Rough windes do shake the darling buds of Maie,
And Sommers lease hath all too short a date:
Sometime too hot the eye of heauen shines,
And often is his gold complexion dimm'd,
And euery faire from faire some-time declines,
By chance, or natures changing course vntrim'd:
But thy eternall Sommer shall not fade,
Nor loose possession of that faire thou ow'st,
Nor shall death brag thou wandr'st in his shade,
When in eternall lines to time thou grow'st,
So long as men can breath or eyes can see,
So long liues this, and this giues life to thee,

3. **Maie**] *Male* L.
10. **loose**] C, M, etc. (except Wy).

This sonnet was omitted from the *Poems* of 1640 and the later editions based on that volume.

3. MALONE: Cf. *Cymb.*, I, iii, 36–37:

> Like the tyrannous breathing of the north
> Shakes all our buds from growing;

and *T. of S.*, V, ii, 140: "As whirlwinds shake fair buds." DOWDEN: We must remember that May in Sh.'s time [was a summer month, running] on to within a few days of our mid June.

7. [On **faire**, see note on 16, 11. There is room for doubt whether the first of the two "fairs" is the abstract noun, or = "fair one" (cf. 21, 4). — ED.]

8. **untrim'd.** SCHMIDT: Stripped of ornamental dress. PORTER: As a ship's sails untrimmed to the course as the winds compel her to be. [Schmidt's explanation is undoubtedly right. — ED.]

10. **ow'st.** For the meaning "own," cf. 70, 14.

12. DOWDEN: This anticipation of immortality for their verse was a commonplace with the sonnet-writers of the time of Elizabeth. See Spenser, *Amoretti*, S. 27, 69, 75; Drayton, *Idea*, S. 6, 44; Daniel, *Delia*, S. 39. [On this subject see especially the notes on S. 55. — ED.]

LEE: There is almost a contradiction in terms between the poet's handling of [the appeal to marry in order that the friend's beauty may survive in children, S. 1–17,] and his emphatic boast in . . . 18–19 that his verse alone is fully equal to the task of immortalizing his friend's youth and accomplishments. (*Life*, p. 98.) [There is indeed good ground for questioning whether these two sonnets should be included, as frequently, in the same group with the preceding, and whether they can be thought of as written at the same time, even if admittedly to the same person. — ED.]

This sonnet was translated into Latin by E. D. Stone, *N. & Q.*, June 10, 1876.

19

DEVOURING time blunt thou the Lyons pawes,
And make the earth deuoure her owne sweet brood,
Plucke the keene teeth from the fierce Tygers yawes,
And burne the long liu'd Phænix in her blood,
Make glad and sorry seasons as thou fleet'st,
And do what ere thou wilt swift-footed time
To the wide world and all her fading sweets:
But I forbid thee one most hainous crime,
O carue not with thy howers my loues faire brow,
Nor draw noe lines there with thine antique pen,
Him in thy course vntainted doe allow,
For beauties patterne to succeding men.
Yet doe thy worst ould Time dispight thy wrong,
My loue shall in my verse euer liue young.

1. **Deuouring**] *Destroying* Walker conj.
3. **yawes**] jaws C, M, etc.
5. **fleet'st**] *fleets* A, Kt, Co, Del, Dy, Sta, Cl, Gl, Kly, Wh, Hal, Do, Hu², R, Ox, Her, Be, N, Bull.
11. **thy**] *the* Hu².
14. **euer liue**] *live ever* Nicholson conj.

This sonnet was also omitted from the 1640 volume.

1. **Devouring time.** VERITY: So Spenser, S. 58: "Devouring time and changeful chance." A reminiscence of Ovid's *edax vetustas?* WALSH: Cf. "The prey of Time, which all things doth devour," Spenser's translation of Bellay's "The Ruins of Rome," 3, 8 (1591); and "Devouring Death," Spenser's own "The Ruins of Time," 52 (1591). The original is Ovid's *Tempus edax, Ex Ponto*, IV, x, 7, and *Met.*, xv, 234. LEE: [Cf. Golding's Ovid:

> Thou Time, the eater up of things, and age of spiteful teen,
> Destroy all things!
>
> (*Qu. Rev.*, 210: 472.)]

[Cf. Daniel's *Delia*, S. 50: "Time's consuming rage." — ED.]

4. **in her blood.** STEEVENS: May signify "burnt alive." [Cf. *Cor.*, IV, vi, 85: "Your temples burned in their cement," which may mean "burned while standing."] [So DELIUS: Having still living blood.] ROLFE: For allusions to the phœnix in Sh., cf. *Temp.*, III, iii, 23; *A. Y. L.*, IV, iii, 17; *H. 8*, V, v, 41; *T. of A.*, II, i, 32; etc. See also *The Phœnix and the Turtle.*

5. **fleet'st.** [For the usual change to *fleets*, see ABBOTT:] In verbs ending with -t, -test final in the second person singular often becomes -ts for euphony. (Cf. "thou torments," *R. 2*, IV, i, 270; "revisits," *Haml.*, I, iv, 53; etc.) . . . This termination in -s contains perhaps a trace of the influence of the northern inflection in -s for the second person singular. (§ 340.) [See FRANZ on the same subject, § 1.]

6. For the punctuation, see P. SIMPSON'S note on 1, 12.

10. **antique.** ROLFE: Accented on the first syllable, as regularly in Sh. TYLER: So called, apparently, as marking age on the countenance.

14. BEECHING: The cadence of this line seems to mark the conclusion of the first section [of the Sonnets].

[The curious reader may find in *Blackwood's Mag.*, 169: 674, some remarks by CREIGHTON to the effect that the first quatrain of this sonnet involves a description of the Pembroke arms, with the trifling changes of panther to tiger and of wyvern to phœnix.]

20

A Womans face with natures owne hand painted,
Haste thou the Master Mistris of my passion,
A womans gentle hart but not acquainted
With shifting change as is false womens fashion,
An eye more bright then theirs, lesse false in rowling:
Gilding the obiect where-vpon it gazeth,
A man in hew all *Hews* in his controwling,
Which steales mens eyes and womens soules amaseth.
And for a woman wert thou first created,
Till nature as she wrought thee fell a dotinge,
And by addition me of thee defeated,
By adding one thing to my purpose nothing.
But since she prickt thee out for womens pleasure,
Mine be thy loue and thy loues vse their treasure.

2. **Haste**] *Hast* 1640, G, etc.
3. **Master Mistris**] *Master, Mistress* G, S, E; hyphened by C, M, etc. (except Wy, N).
7. **man in**] *maiden* Be conj. **Hews**] *Hue* S², E; '*hues*' Gl, Cam, Wh², Her.
9. **wert**] *went* 1640.

[With the theme of this sonnet Massey compares Chapman:

A youth so sweet of face
That many thought him of the female race;

and Marlowe, *H. & L.*,

Some swore he was a maid in men's attire,
For in his looks were all that men desire. (p. 39.)

Von Mauntz compares Ovid, *Metam.*, 8, 322–23:

Facies, quam dicere vere
Virgineam in puero, puerilem in virgine posses.]

1. **Master Mistris.** Schmidt: A male mistress, one loved like a woman. Malone: Does not perhaps mean "man-mistress," but *sovereign* mistress. [Modern usage is undoubtedly right in hyphenating the words, and they should be understood as coördinate; the notion is either "both master and mistress" or "whether master or mistress I can hardly say." — Ed.] **passion.** Schmidt: Amorous desire. Massey: [Synonymous with "poem." Cf. Watson's *Passion-*

ate Century, 1582, whose 100 sonnets are called "passions" throughout; and *M. N. D.*, where the ditties of Pyramus and Thisbe are so called.] Thus the "passion" of Sh. is not an affair of the heart, . . . [but] the theme on which he writes; . . . so the effeminacy of the woman-like love in wooing a male friend vanishes from the sonnets. (pp. 39–40.) DOWDEN [notes the same interpretation of *passion* as having been suggested to him by H. C. Hart.]

5. **false in rowling.** DOWDEN: Cf. Spenser, *F. Q.*, Bk. 3, c. i, s. 41:

> Her wanton eyes (ill signes of womanhed)
> Did roll too lightly.

TYLER: Cf. 139, 6; 140, 14.

7. **man in hew.** SCHMIDT [gives only "colour" for the meaning of "hue." The *N. E. D.* notes "form, shape, appearance," as the first (though obsolete) meaning (cf. Gothic *hiwi* = form, appearance).] DOWDEN: The word was used by Elizabethan writers not only in the sense of "complexion," but also in that of "shape, form." In *F. Q.*, Bk. 5, c. ix, ss. 17–18, Talus tries to seize Malengin, who transforms himself into a fox, a bush, a bird, a stone, and then a hedgehog:

> Then gan it run away incontinent
> Being returned to his former *hew*.

The meaning . . . then may be "A man in form and appearance, having the mastery over all forms in that of his," etc. With the phrase "controlling hues" cf. S. 106, 8. BEECHING: In all other places where Sh. uses the word it means "appearance," "complexion" (cf. *Per.*, IV, i, 41, "that excellent complexion which did *steal the eyes* of old and young"). A beautiful complexion might be said to "control" others by making the colour come and go, but one shape could have no influence on another. The words "man in" almost certainly are a corruption of some epithet, because a manly hue would neither steal men's eyes nor surprise women's souls; and the whole point of the sonnet is that the friend's beauty is feminine. In the previous two lines his "eye" has been compared with a woman's, and we should expect a similar comparison as to his "hue" to preserve the balance of the double comparison in the first quatrain. I propose, therefore, to read "a *maiden* hue." My friend Mr. J. W. Mackail prefers "a *native* hue" (*Haml.*, III, i, 84) as being nearer to the *ductus literarum* of "a man in hue." That would depend on the handwriting; *id* in an Elizabethan hand looks very like *n* with a final flourish, and for the mistake of *in* for *en*, cf. "bitter" for "better" in 91, 9. Further, "native" repeats the point already made in l. 1, while "maiden" would prepare the way for l. 9. [I must record my conviction that this is one of the most plausible emendations which have been proposed in connection with the text of the Sonnets. — ED.]

Hews. BOSWELL: Mr. Tyrwhitt has pointed out to me a line . . . which inclines me to think that the initials W. H. in the Dedication stand for W. Hughes. [This line quoted.] The name Hughes was formerly written *Hews*. When it is considered that one of these Sonnets is formed entirely on a play on our author's Christian name, this conjecture will not appear improbable.

(*Prelim. Remarks*, ed. 1821, p. 217.) BROWNE [discusses the Hughes conjecture in *Ath.*, Aug. 30, 1873, mentioning two Elizabethan musicians named Hewes.] FURNIVALL [(*N. & Q.*, 5th s., 5: 443) gives a list of contemporaries with Sh. named Hughes.] MASSEY: It is "Ewes" that was aimed at by the *double entendre*, which leads us beyond the mere name to a person of importance; for "Ewe" was a title of Essex. The Earldom was that of "Essex and Ewe." "A man in hue, all Ewes in his controlling" was as far as Sh. could go in telling his friend that his comeliness and favour were far superior to those of the favourite, and that these gave him the upper hand. (p. 54.) TYLER: The notion that *Hews* was intended to indicate a certain Mr. William Hughes . . . scarcely needs to be refuted. WYNDHAM: I retain the Q type and spelling, being persuaded that the word was so printed intentionally. . . . The line means "A man in shape all shapes in his controlling." Cf. 53, 5–8, 12. It states that the friend was the eternal pattern of Beauty. But the type selected for "hues," thanks to contemporary spelling, *Hews*, enabled the poet to convey something more which was apparent to the person addressed and is not apparent now. Of this I am convinced. But beyond this all is guesswork. Some hold that Mr. W. H. of the dedication was the friend, and that his name was William Hughes; others seek an anagram in the letters. . . . [*Hews* contains the initials of Henry Wriothesley, Earl of Southampton]. Others may riddle it: He = Herbert, W. S. = Shakespeare. . . . It is strange that a passage in Chapman's Preface to the Reader (*Homer's Iliads*) has so far escaped [the attention of those who take Chapman as the rival poet mentioned in the Sonnets:] "Another right learned, honest, and entirely loved friend of mine, M. Robert Hews." LEE: [The Hughes theory is a fantastic suggestion.] No known contemporary of the name, either in age or position in life, bears any resemblance to the young man who is addressed by Sh. in his sonnets. (*Life*, p. 93n.) BUTLER: There was a William Hughes, or Hewes (both forms appearing), who after having been "many years" in the navy and served as steward in the Vanguard, Swiftsure, and Dreadnought, applied in 1633–34 for the post of cook, which I learn was rather more highly paid than that of steward; he was appointed, and died in March 1636–37. This man is quite as likely to have been Mr. W. H. as any of the others. (p. 115.) [This is surely a pleasingly violent reaction from the usual dabbling with noblemen in connection with the sonnet mystery. — ED.] CREIGHTON: A play upon one of the baronies or courtesy titles of the Earl of Pembroke, — Fitzhugh, or Fitzhew; so that the line construes: "A man in hew (my lord Fitzhew), — the lord of all the sons of Hew." (*Blackwood*, 169: 672.) BEECHING: As the word stands on the page in the Q it certainly looks momentous. . . . But it must be noted that what chiefly impresses the modern reader is the capital letter with the italics; and this is found with *every* word printed in italics throughout the sonnets, so that a capital letter to a reader of the Q would not be in the least suggestive of a proper name as it is to us. Moreover, the line contains no pun, such as we have upon the name "Will" in S. 135, etc. (Intro., p. xlii.) MACKAIL: No argument can be safely based on the capital and the italics, for these are found elsewhere, in such common words

as *autumn*, *informer*, *heretic*, and *statues*, and are clearly a mere irrelevant eccentricity of the type-setter in a very irregularly and carelessly printed volume. (p. 194.) [On this matter of the italic type, see the notes on *rose* in 1, 2. — Ed.] Porter: There is reason enough for [the italics] in the special Elizabethan sense of *hew* and *Hews*, i.e., shape, joined with the common sense, "hue," appropriately alluding here to the complexion as that of a "woman's face" painted fair by Nature's hand, and the larger sense of the sonnet as a whole, in its praise of the double charm of masculine and feminine *Hews*, or shapes. W. B. Brown [revives the pun theory in *N. & Q.*, 11th s., 7: 241, 262, finding puns also in 6, 5; 78, 3; 134, 10; and elsewhere.] H. D. Gray: The type of pun [found in this line] seems to me so uncharacteristic that the italicized word gives us the only name which Sh.'s friend could *not* have borne. If Sh. used this sort of cryptogram, then there is little to say against the Baconian theory. (*Pub. M. L. A.*, n.s. 23: 634n.)

controwling. Schmidt: Overpowering, being superior to. [Cf. 107, 3, and *Cor.*, III, i, 161: "Not having the power to do the good it would, for the ill which doth control 't."] Tyler: Rendering all others subordinate. Beeching: May mean "including and harmonizing all particular beauties of complexion in his," an idea put from the other side in S. 53, or perhaps, "commanding all other faces by his," an idea expanded in the line that follows.

8. **Which.** Walker: Refers to *all hues*, not to *a man*. [Lettsom adds that W. evidently meant to *the fact* expressed by "all hues . . . controlling."] (3: 357.)

9–11. Isaac: Cf. Marlowe, *H. & L.*, 87–88:

> And such as knew he was a man would say,
> "Leander, thou art made for amorous play."
>
> (*Jahrb.*, 19: 249.)

Walsh: Cf. Ausonius, *In Puerum Formosum:*

> Dum dubitat Natura, marem faceretne puellam,
> Factus es, o pulcher, paene puella, puer!

11. **defeated.** Schmidt: Disappointed, [i.e., in the sense of "deprived." — Ed.]

Steevens: It is impossible to read this fulsome panegyric, addressed to a male object, without an equal mixture of disgust and indignation. We may remark also, that the same phrase employed by Sh. to denote the height of encomium, is used by Dryden to express the extreme of reproach:

> If a man,
> Corrupted to a woman; thy man-mistress.
>
> (*Don Sebastian.*)

[It will be noted, of course, that this is *not* the same phrase as Sh.'s. — Ed.] Malone: Some part of this indignation might perhaps have been abated, if it had been considered that such addresses to men, however indelicate, were customary in our author's time, and neither imported criminality nor were es-

teemed indecorous. See a note on *lover*, S. 32. FURNIVALL [regards the sonnet as Sh.'s answer to] the thoughtless objection that many sonnets in this group confuse the sex of the person they're addressed to. (Intro., p. lxv.).

[Surely it is with vanity and quite needless vexation of spirit that this sonnet has been made a means of adding to the troublous suspicion that some form of sexual perversion lurks in the collection. Call the third quatrain obscene, if need be, but do not fail — as many have done — to note its wholly light and humorous tone, in contrast with the hectic intensity of morbid eroticism. It is so different from what Sh. was able to do, on occasion, when it was his purpose to represent passion, that one may agree unhesitatingly with HARRIS (*The Man Sh.*, p. 234), who, though calling the poet a sensualist, observes that "the sextet of this sonnet absolutely disproves" the implications of Steevens and others. To the same effect is BRANDL's recent Introduction, where it is truly observed that the very substance of S. 20 is to the effect that the friend may enjoy women — the poet wishes only the love of his heart. (p. xxvii.) — ED.]

[Esoteric interpreters of the Sonnets have found S. 20 especially fascinating. An anonymous writer in *Blackwood's* (137: 774), interprets it as referring to the dual character of "eternal love" in the platonic philosophy, and compares Fenton's *Monophyle* (1572), as follows: "[The philosophers] imagined love to be a most excellent form or plot, exceeding generally the consideration of man, and therefore did figure unto us an *Androgina* in whom they meant a man composed of masculine and feminine sex." It was Sh.'s study of St. Augustine and Dante, the critic continues, which "led him to adopt the truly grand idea pictured in the 20th Sonnet." GODWIN also interprets mystically: Sh. is here representing the personified genius of all art as androgynous, or double-sexed. (p. 179.)]

GEORGE ROSS, [in his essay on "Sh.'s Mad Characters," makes the following observation:] As in heaven there is no marrying nor giving in marriage, so in the poetic elysium there is no sex. . . . No doubt Sh. himself, at a later day, trembled at his own temerity, . . . but . . . his sonnets remain to show that it is possible to ascend to a region of abstraction, where fact is absorbed in feeling and sex is one and indivisible. (*Studies*, p. 52.)

H. D. GRAY [finds this sonnet to be opposed to both the Southampton and Pembroke theories, since it is] incredible that Sh. should have told either of these earls, even in jest, that only sex stood in the way of his grace's marriage to an actor. (*Pub. M. L. A.*, n.s. 23: 643.)

[It seems to be S. 20 to which we must attach a remark recorded in Coleridge's *Table Talk* (May 14, 1833):] It seems to me that the Sonnets could only have come from a man deeply in love, and in love with a woman; and there is one sonnet which, from its incongruity, I take to be a purposed blind.

21

So is it not with me as with that Muse,
Stird by a painted beauty to his verse,
Who heauen it selfe for ornament doth vse,
And euery faire with his faire doth reherse,
Making a coopelment of proud compare
With Sunne and Moone, with earth and seas rich gems:
With Aprills first borne flowers and all things rare,
That heauens ayre in this huge rondure hems,
O let me true in loue but truly write,
And then beleeue mẽ, my loue is as faire,
As any mothers childe, though not so bright
As those gould candells fixt in heauens ayer:
Let them say more that like of heare-say well,
I will not prayse that purpose not to sell.

1. **is it**] *it is* M¹.

5. **coopelment**] *complement* G¹, S¹; *compliment* G², S², E; *couplement* C, M, etc.

6. **earth**] *eatth* 1640.

8. **this**] *his* E, A, Kly. **ayre in this**] *vault in his* Sta conj.

12. **those**] *these* N [error]. **in heauens ayer**] *i' the heavens are* But.

With this sonnet cf. S. 130 and notes.

WYNDHAM: This sonnet offers the first attack on the false art of a rival poet. BEECHING: [The Muse here mentioned is] not the rival poet mentioned later who praised W. H., for he, *ex hypothesi*, was not a "painted beauty." TYLER: Possibly some particular poet may be intended.

4. **faire.** See note on 18, 7.

5. **coopelment.** MALONE: I formerly thought this word was of our author's invention, but I have lately found it in Spenser's *F. Q.*: "Allied with bands of mutual couplement." [The *N. E. D.* cites other examples from the 16th century. — ED.] SCHMIDT: Combination.

8. **rondure.** MALONE: A round; *rondeur*, Fr. Cf. *K.J.*, II, i, 259: "'Tis not the roundure of your old-fac'd walls." [Malone erroneously refers the line to *Henry V.*] TYLER: [Probably] the vast circumference of the limiting horizon.

9. **true in love.** HENRY BROWN: The poet's motto. His seal, preserved at Stratford, bears the initials, "W. S.," entwined with the true lovers' knot. (p. 170.)

12. **candells.** MALONE: Cf. *R. & J.*, III, v, 9: "Night's candles are burnt out"; *Macb.*, II, i, 5: "There's husbandry in heaven; their candles are all out"; *M.V.*, V, i, 220: "By these blessed candles of the night." VERITY: [Cf. also Fairfax's Tasso, Bk. ix, st. 10, "When heaven's small candles next shall shine"; Linche's (?) *Diella*, 30: "He that can count the candles of the sky"; and several passages in Marlowe, Bullen ed., 2: 137, 158, 196.]

13. **like of heare-say.** DOWDEN: Schmidt's explanation is "that fall in love with what has been praised by others"; but does it not rather mean, "that like to be buzzed about by talk"? ROLFE: Apparently referring to the commonplace style of which he has been speaking. TYLER: Are pleased with idle and extravagant talk. BEECHING: Like vague and exaggerated rumour.

13–14. STEEVENS: Cf. *L. L. L.*, IV, iii, 239–40:

> Fie, painted rhetoric! O, she needs it not.
> To things of sale a seller's praise belongs.

MALONE: Cf. *T. & C.*, IV, i, 78: "We'll not commend what we intend to sell" [noting Warburton's conjecture that it should read "intend *not* sell"]. WYNDHAM: Cf. Daniel, *Delia*, S. 53:

> None other fame, mine unambitious Muse
> Affected ever, but t' eternize thee!
> All other honours do my hopes refuse,
> Which meaner prized and momentary be.
> For, God forbid! I should my papers blot
> With mercenary lines, with servile pen;
> Praising virtues in them that have them not,
> Basely attending on the hopes of men.

BEECHING: Cf. 102, 3–4.

[MAIN: For examples of the kind of "couplement of proud compare" which Sh. here ridicules, cf. Daniel, *Delia*, S. 19:

> Restore thy tresses to the golden ore!
> Yield Cytherea's son those arks of love!
> Bequeath the heavens the stars that I adore!
> And to the Orient do thy pearls remove!
> Yield thy hands' pride unto the ivory white!
> To Arabian odour give thy breathing sweet!
> Restore thy blush unto Aurora bright!
> To Thetis give the honour of thy feet! (etc.);

Barnes, *Parthenophil & Parthenophe*, S. 48:

> Her hairs no grace of golden wires want;
> Pure pearls with perfect rubines are inset;
> True diamonds, in eyes; sapphires, in veins; (etc.);

Davies of Hereford's *Wit's Pilgrimage*, S. 73; Spenser, *Amoretti*, S. 9:

> Long while I sought to what I might compare
> Those powerful eyes, which lighten my dark spright;

Yet find I naught on earth, to which I dare
Resemble th' image of their goodly light.
Not to the sun; for they do shine by night:
Nor to the moon; for they are changed never:
Nor to the stars; for they have purer sight:
Nor to the fire; for they consume not ever:
Nor to the lightning; for they still persever:
Nor to the diamond; for they are more tender:
Nor unto crystal; for nought may them sever:
Nor unto glass; such baseness mought offend her.
Then to the Maker self they likest be,
Whose light doth lighten all that here we see;

ibid., S. 64:

Her lips did smell like unto gillyflowers;
Her ruddy cheeks like unto roses red;
Her snowy brows like budded bellamoures;
Her lovely eyes like pinks but newly spread;
Her goodly bosom like a strawberry bed;
Her neck like to a bunch of columbines;
Her breast, like lilies ere their leaves be shed;
Her nipples, like young blossomed jessamines; (etc.).]

[DOWDEN adds to the list Griffin, *Fidessa*, S. 39:

My lady's hair is threads of beaten gold,
Her front the purest crystal eye hath seen,
Her eyes the brightest stars the heavens hold,
Her cheeks red roses such as seld have been; (etc.);

and Constable's *Diana*, 6th Decade, S. 1:

One sun unto my life's day gives true light;
One moon dissolves my stormy night of woes;
One star my fate and happy fortune shows;
One saint I serve, one shrine with vows I dight.

On the other hand, for the ridicule of this type of love poetry, he cites Sidney, *A. & S.*, S. 3:

Let dainty wits cry on the Sisters nine,
That bravely maskt, their fancies may be told;
Or Pindar's apes flaunt they in phrases fine,
Enamelling with pied flowers their thoughts of gold;
Or else let them in statelier glory shine,
Ennobling new-found tropes with problems old;
Or with strange similes enrich each line,
Of herbs or beasts which Inde or Afric hold;

and Sh. himself in *L. L. L.*, V. ii, 406:

> Taffeta phrases, silken terms precise,
> Three-piled hyperboles, spruce affectation,
> Figures pedantical.

KRAUSS (*Jahrb.*, 16: 176) notes also S. 55 of *A. & S.*:

> Muses! I oft invoked your holy aid,
> With choicest flowers my speech t' engarland so,
> That it, despised in true but naked show,
> Might win some grace in your sweet grace arrayed.
> And oft whole troops of saddest words I stayed,
> Striving abroad a foraging to go.]

WYNDHAM: Cf. Du Bellay, *Contre les Petrarquides :*

> De voz beautez, ce n'est que tout fin or,
> Perles, crystal, marbre, et ivoyre encor,
> Et tout l'honneur de l'Indique thresor,
> Fleurs, lis, œillets, et roses.

D. KLEIN [quotes also, from the same poem of Du Bellay's:]

> J'ay oublié l'art de petrarquiser,
> Je veux d'amour franchement deviser,
> Sans vous flatter et sans me déguiser.

(*Sewanee Rev.*, 13: 458.)

The whole poem, of several pages, offers a close parallel to the similar attacks in the Sonnets. A poet was expected to disclaim the practice of Petrarch's imitators and to trounce his rivals for observing it. Drayton does both.

[ACHESON views this sonnet as written in ridicule of Chapman's *The Amorous Zodiac*, 1595. Cf. especially stanzas 8–9:

> Thy smooth embow'd brow, where all grace I see,
> My second month, and second house shall be;
> Which brow with her clear beauties shall delight
> The Earth, yet sad, and overture confer
> To herbs, buds, flowers and verdure-gracing Ver,
> Rendering her more than Summer exquisite.
>
> All this fresh April, this sweet month of Venus,
> I will admire this brow so bounteous;
> This brow, brave court of love and virtue builded;
> This brow, where Chastity holds garrison;
> This brow, that blushless none can look upon;
> This brow, with every grace and honour gilded;

and stanza 30 (from L'Envoi):

> But, gracious love, if jealous heaven deny
> My life this truly blest variety,

Yet will I thee through all the world disperse;
If not in heaven, *amongst those braving fires*,
Yet here thy beauties, which the world admires,
Bright as those flames shall glister in my verse.

This comparison "not only clearly shows to what Sh. refers as 'those gold candles fix'd in heaven's air,' but plainly reveals his stroke at Chapman's vanity and self-praise, and also proves . . . that Sh. here avows that his sonnets were not written for sale." (*Sh. & the Rival Poet*, p. 69.) All this is but a fragment of Mr. Acheson's elaborate theory of a Chapman-Shakespeare quarrel, which cannot be adequately represented here. The parallels just cited are among the most plausible of many dubious ones. A reviewer of Acheson's book (*Spectator*, Nov. 21, 1903, p. 872) adds the suggestion that line 14 may contain a play on Chapman's name, — "That is a chapman's way of praising, not mine." — ED.]

GODWIN: Can we doubt that the poet was here writing of a woman? No poet then or since, writing of man, indulged in the extravagance of diction which Sh. disclaims. [In like manner, WALSH groups the sonnet with those to the poet's dark mistress, in collocation with the admittedly similar S. 130.]

22

MY glasse shall not perswade me I am ould,
So long as youth and thou are of one date,
But when in thee times forrwes I behould,
Then look I death my daies should expiate.
For all that beauty that doth couer thee,
Is but the seemely rayment of my heart,
Which in thy brest doth liue, as thine in me,
How can I then be elder then thou art?
O therefore loue be of thy selfe so wary,
As I not for my selfe, but for thee will,
Bearing thy heart which I will keepe so chary
As tender nurse her babe from faring ill,
Presume not on thy heart when mine is slaine,
Thou gau'st me thine not to giue backe againe.

2. **are**] *art* 1640, L, G, S, E.
3. **forrwes**] *forrowes* 1640, L; *sorrows* G, S, E; *furrows* C, M, etc.
4. **expiate**] *expirate* Stee conj., Hu².
11. **thy**] *my* First Folio ed. [error].

1. **ould.** ISAAC [points out the conventional character of this theme of wrinkled age. Cf. Barnfield's *Affectionate Shepherd:*

> Behold my gray head, full of silver hairs,
> My wrinkled skin, deep furrows in my face;

Gascoigne's *Flowers:* "My wrinkled cheeks bewray that pride of heat is past"; Daniel's S. 21: "Whilst age upon my wasted body steals"; and passages in Tasso and Petrarch. (*Jahrb.*, 17: 170–71.)] LEE: Cf. 62, 9–10; 73, 1–2; 138, 6. [Sh.'s] reference . . . to his growing age was a conventional device — traceable to Petrarch — of all sonnetteers of the day, and admits of no literal interpretation. . . . Daniel in *Delia*, 23, when 29 years old, exclaimed: "My years draw on my everlasting night, . . . My days are done." [This is S. 23 of the "Poems and Sonnets" printed after Sidney's *A. & S.*, 1591, not of the *Delia* volume. — ED.] . . . Similarly Drayton, in a sonnet (*Idea*, 14) published in 1594, when he was barely 31, wrote:

> Looking into the glass of my youth's miseries,
> I see the ugly face of my deformed cares,
> With withered brows all wrinkled with despairs;

and a little later (No. 43 of the 1599 edition) he repeated how "Age rules my lines with wrinkles in my face." All these lines are echoes of Petrarch, and Sh. and Drayton followed the Italian master's words more closely than their contemporaries. Cf. Petrarch's S. 143 (to Laura alive), or S. 81 (to Laura after death); the latter begins:

> Dicemi spesso il mio fidato speglio,
> L' animo stanco e la cangiata scorza
> E la scemata mia destrezza e forza:
> Non ti nasconder più; tu se' pur veglio.

(i.e., "My faithful glass often shows me my weary spirit and my wrinkled skin, and my decaying wit and strength: it cannot longer be hidden from you, you are old.") (*Life*, p. 86.) [On this subject see further under Sonnets 62 and 73. TYLER, noting the similar passages in Drayton, is disposed to view them as borrowings from Sh. (Intro., p. 41.) — ED.]

4. **expiate.** STEEVENS: I do not comprehend how the poet's days were to be *expiated* by death. Perhaps he wrote: "my days should *expirate*," i.e., bring them to an end. Cf. *R. & J.*, I, iv, 109: "Expire the term of a despised life," [and the words "festinate," "conspirate," "combinate," "ruinate," in other plays.] MALONE: The old reading is certainly right. Then do I expect, says Sh., that death should fill up the measure of my days. [Cf. *Locrine*, 1595: "Lives Sabren yet to expiate my wrath?", i.e., fully to satisfy my wrath; Chapman's *Byron's Conspiracy*, 1608, [where] an old courtier says he is "A poor and expiate humour of the court"; and *R. 3*, III, iii, 23: "Make haste; the hour of death is expiate."] SCHMIDT: Bring to a close. *N. E. D.*: To extinguish (a person's rage) by suffering it to the full; to end (one's sorrows, a suffering life) by death.

5–7. MASSEY: Cf. Sidney, *Arcadia :*

> My wealth is you,
> My beauty's hue your beams, my health your deeds;
> My mind for weeds your virtue's livery wears;

and (*ibid.*):

> My true-love hath my heart, and I have his,
> By just exchange one for the other given:
> I hold his dear, and mine he cannot miss,
> There never was a better bargain driven.
> His heart in me keeps me and him in one,
> My heart in him his thoughts and senses guides;
> He loves my heart for once it was his own;
> I cherish his because in me it bides. (p. 74.)

[In this familiar Elizabethan conceit the more esoteric interpreters find a deeper significance. Thus HERAUD observes:] This *quasi* identification of the subject and object doubtless suggested to [Barnstorff] the notion . . . that the poet throughout addressed himself. The error is very pardonable, but easily corrected. It was not his *ego*, but his *alter ego*, in the ideal personality, in the universal humanity, that the poet apostrophised. [Cf. S. 62.] (p. 491.) SIMPSON: Such phrases as "My heart is in thy breast" . . . and the like, which now seem to us frigid conceits, were in Sh.'s days warm with the blood of a still living philosophy. [Cf. 48, 10–11, where he justifies] the expression by insinuating a distinction between his own living and acting self and that soul of his which in the ecstasy of love had taken up its abode in his friend's breast. (p. 32.)

10. [The apparent necessity for emphasizing "thee" makes the rhythm of this line unusual and awkward. — ED.]

11–14. DOWDEN: The first hint of possible wrong committed by the youth against friendship.

14. HENRY BROWN: Cf. Wyatt, ["The Lover Forsaketh his Unkind Love":]

> My heart I gave thee, not to do it pain,
> But to preserve, lo, it to thee was taken. (p. 170.)

23

As an vnperfect actor on the stage,
Who with his feare is put besides his part,
Or some fierce thing repleat with too much rage,
Whose strengths abondance weakens his owne heart;
So I for feare of trust, forget to say,
The perfect ceremony of loues right,
And in mine owne loues strength seeme to decay,
Ore-charg'd with burthen of mine owne loues might:
O let my books be then the eloquence,
And domb presagers of my speaking brest,
Who pleade for loue, and look for recompence,
More then that tonge that more hath more exprest.
O learne to read what silent loue hath writ,
To heare wit eies belongs to loues fine wiht.

2. **put**] *but* L. **besides**] *beside* C, M[1], Co[2], Hu[2], But, Be.
4. **strengths abondance**] *strength abondance* L; *strength abundance* G[1]; *strength abundant* G[2], S, E.
5. **of**] *or* Sta conj.
6. **right**] *rite* M, etc.
8. **burthen**] *burden* G[2], S[2], E, Co, Del, Hu, Dy, Sta, Cl, Gl, Hal, R, Wh[2], Ox, Her, Be, N, Wa.
9. **books**] *looks* S, E, C, But, Be, Wa, Tu.
10. **presagers**] *presages* Co[2] [error].
12. **that more**] *that love* Sta conj.; *that less* But. **more hath**] *hath not* G[2]. **more exprest**] *o'erexprest* Wa conj.
14. **wit . . . wiht**] *with . . . wit* 1640, G, etc.

WALSH: The edition of 1640 for once gives a tolerable title, heading this [sonnet] "A Bashful Lover." It might then belong [with 128 and 136,] — not that it must have necessarily belonged to the dark mistress. SIMPSON: [This sonnet turns upon another commonplace of Renaissance sonnet philosophy.] This trembling, prescribed by the *Codex Amoris*, is spoken of in the 4th, 5th, 6th, and 7th Sonnets of Dante's *Vita Nuova*, and in several of Petrarch's, as S. 34. (p. 54.)

ISAAC [notes parallels for the idea of a love too great for words, in Spenser, Watson, Raleigh, Wyatt, Tasso, and Petrarch. He also cites, for the notion of the eyes as interpreters of the heart, Daniel, S. 8, "You mine eyes, the

agents of my heart"; Southwell, "Her eye in silence hath a speech Which eye best understands"; and Spenser, *Amoretti*, 43: "Mine eyes, with meek humility, Love-learned letters to her eyes to read."] (*Jahrb.*, 17: 172–73.)

HENRY BROWN [compares a sonnet by John Davies:]

> My looks shall be love, and wit's record-books,
> Wherein she still may read what I conceive
> Of her sweet words, and what replies I give. (p. 171.)

1–2. MALONE: Cf. *Cor.*, V, iii, 40–42:

> Like a dull actor now,
> I have forgot my part, and I am out,
> Even to a full disgrace.

. . . It may be conjectured that these poems were not composed till our author had arrived in London, and became conversant with the stage. He had perhaps himself experienced what he here describes. STEEVENS: It is highly probable that our author had seen plays represented, before he left his own country. MALONE: The seeing a few plays exhibited by a company of strollers in a barn at Stratford, or in Warwick Castle, would not however have made Sh. acquainted with the feelings of a timid actor on the stage.

2. **besides.** [This form of the preposition has abundant parallel in Sh. For the meaning, cf. the 1611 Authorized Version, 2 *Cor.* 5: 13: "Whether we be besides our selves" (cited in *N. E. D.*). — ED.]

3–4. TYLER: Some fierce animal which has lost self-control.

5. **for feare of trust.** DELIUS: From want of self-confidence. DOWDEN: Schmidt explains "doubting of being trusted," but the comparison is to an imperfect actor, who dare not trust himself. Observe the construction of the first 8 lines; 5–6 refer to 1–2; 7–8 to 3–4. [With this ROLFE agrees.] TYLER: It seems doubtful whether [this] is to be regarded as meaning "fearing that I shall not be trusted," or "fearing to trust myself." . . . I prefer the former. BEECHING: The parallel with the actor shows that trust is active. PORTER: Wanting to trust so sorely that he does not dare to.

8. MCCLUMPHA: Cf. *R. & J.*, I, iv, 22: "Under love's heavy burden do I sink." (*Jahrb.*, 40: 189.)

9. **books.** MALONE: [* Capell] would read "O let my looks," etc. But the context, I think, shows that the old copy is right. The poet finding that he could not sufficiently collect his thoughts to express his esteem by speech, requests that his writings may speak for him. So afterwards: "O learn to read what silent love hath writ." Had "looks" been the author's word, he hardly would have used it again in the next line but one. BOSWELL: It is dangerous to make any alteration where the old copy is intelligible, or I should give a decided preference to the reading [of Capell]; the eloquence of *looks* is more in unison with love's fine wit, which can hear with eyes. [It will be noticed that both Malone and Boswell overlook the fact that Sewell had made the change proposed by Capell. — ED.] ISAAC: [The Q reading] surely suits well

neither the progress of thought in the sonnet nor any image presented by this verse, while "looks" meets all the demands of harmony of ideas and pregnancy of imagery. . . . In line 12 the books are brought into a wholly unintelligible contrast with the tongue; in this case they must say more than the tongue, which otherwise can express itself more and better than books. I take this to be nonsense. . . . [Again, of line 13:] for the understanding of written love-poems one needs only a knowledge of writing and a small modicum of sense. Since the poet must assume both these on the part of his loved one, and the understanding of his verses is certainly not made difficult by any obscure manner of utterance, I can find absolutely nothing which was to be learned. . . . How the poet is able to name a love "silent" which is expressed in love poems, is not readily understood; while one cannot possibly object to the beautiful suggestion that silent love writes its poems in the countenance. . . . Sh. compares the eye frequently to a book in which one writes or reads: cf. 93, 7–8; *L. L. L.*, IV, ii, 113; *M. N. D.*, II, ii, 122; *W.T.*, IV, iv, 172; *R. & J.*, I, iii, 81 ff. He uses "write" in this imaginative sense very abundantly. [Cf. also Spenser's 43d Sonnet, cited above, both for the general idea and the word "wit," — "Which her deep wit . . . will soon conceive and learn to construe well." Sh. may have had this sonnet in mind.] . . . If, then, we simply reject the unhappy word "books," everything forced, labored, and abstruse vanishes from the verses; and if we put "looks" in its place, we can enjoy one of the most beautiful of Sh.'s sonnets unimpaired. (*Archiv*, 59: 263–67.) DOWDEN: The books of which Sh. speaks are probably the MS. books in which he writes his sonnets. MASSEY: These books are the sonnets sent in "written embassage." They were the "dumb presagers" of that which he intended to say, and afterwards did say, publicly to his friend when he printed [*V. & A.* and *Lucrece*, dedicated to Southampton]. (p. 37.) SARRAZIN [also believes the books were the *V. & A.* and the *Lucrece*. (*Jahrb.*, 34: 371, and *Sh.'s Lehrjahre*, p. 169.)] ROLFE: The old reading is supported by line 13. J. G. B. [(*Shakespeariana*, 2: 495) defends the emendation "looks," on the ground that to "look for recompense" is the office of an eye rather than a book. With "presagers," too, he compares *V. & A.*, 457, where "ill presage" refers to Adonis's *look*.] BEECHING: "Looks" . . . is an almost certain emendation, for a distinction between writing and saying is not here to the point. Even if a "book" might be contrasted with a "tongue," and spoken of as "dumb," how could it be a *presager* of speech? And if "what silent love hath writ" is simply a sonnet, why should any one need to "learn to read" it? . . . The alliteration of the line confirms the correction. BULLEN: I keep the Q reading, though I admit that Sewell's "looks" is a highly probable emendation. ACHESON [gives a new turn to Dowden's interpretation, dividing the Sonnets into groups of 20,] bound together in some crude way . . . in what Sh. calls "books." (*Sh. & the Rival Poet*, p. 43.) [Though but few editors have felt justified in introducing the emendation into the text, I believe that Isaac's and Beeching's arguments are fairly conclusive. Of all the considerations urged, that of Rolfe seems to me the most baseless. — ED.]

10. **domb presagers.** BEECHING: The reference is to a preliminary dumb show, like that before the play in *Hamlet*. VON MAUNTZ: Cf. Sidney, *A. & S.*, 61: "Now with slow words, now with dumb eloquence"; and Sonnet 85, 14.

12. DELIUS: My tongue, which has said more and said that more more clearly. DOWDEN: More than that tongue (the tongue of another person than Sh.) which hath more fully expressed more ardours of love, or more of your perfections. ROLFE: ["That tongue" is probably] any tongue, however eloquent. TYLER: A recompense greater (first "more") than "that tongue" (the voice of my books) hath better (third "more") expressed than my voice could do that greater love and recompense ("that more") which I plead for. I have here adopted an interpretation suggested to me by Mr. G. Bernard Shaw. [BUTLER's emendation he is bold to introduce because of "Sh.'s love of antithesis"; "less" he interprets as] less recompense than my eyes are now pleading for. ABBOTT: "More" is frequently used as a noun and adverb in juxtaposition. Cf. *Lear*, V, iii, 202: "If there be more, more woeful." (§ 51.)

FLEAY [views this sonnet as a kind of parody of a passage in Daniel's *Complaint of Rosamond*, st. 19:

> Sweet silent rhetoric of persuading eyes;
> Dumb eloquence, whose power doth move the blood
> More than the words or wisdom of the wise.]

"Eloquence and dumb presagers" is a palpable hit at the "silent rhetoric" and "dumb eloquence." . . . The last line of the sonnet is to my mind not serious, but a very delicate thrust at Daniel's lines, often, but more roughly burlesqued by subsequent writers. (*Biog. Chron.*, 2: 216.)

BUTLER [(pp. 69–70) attaches to this sonnet, apparently in connection with S. 20, some repulsive suspicions which it is neither easy nor desirable to comprehend. — ED.]

ISAAC: [Addressed to a woman.] The tone, with all consideration for the extravagant conception of friendship in that time, is decidedly too tender for a sonnet of friendship. (*Archiv*, 59: 262.) GODWIN [thinks this to be the first sonnet addressed to the lady, perhaps dropped into her lap by the poet]. (p. 133.) W. C. HAZLITT: [The sonnet] seems to have been composed just when circumstances led to a suspension of theatrical performances in London in 1593 and the appearance of Sh. as a lyrical writer. He appears to glance at his own not too successful efforts as a performer of parts, and to point to his books, that is, his two poems, as pleaders for him. (*Sh., Himself and His Work*, p. 252.)

E. J. ELLIS: The sense of [this sonnet] is in couplets, the lines falling by their meaning into pairs all the way through, the second of each pair repeating and completing the first after the manner of "parallelisms" which form the rhyme of biblical poetry. The 5th and 6th lines are exceptions, but the rest show this accidental quality so strikingly that they suggest how Hebrew poetry might be translated into English without losing its own intention, and yet be made to belong to the songship of another language.

24

Mine eye hath play'd the painter and hath steeld,
Thy beauties forme in table of my heart,
My body is the frame wherein ti's held,
And perspectiue it is best Painters art.
For through the Painter must you see his skill,
To finde where your true Image pictur'd lies,
Which in my bosomes shop is hanging stil,
That hath his windowes glazed with thine eyes:
Now see what good-turnes eyes for eies haue done,
Mine eyes haue drawne thy shape, and thine for me
Are windowes to my brest, where-through the Sun
Delights to peepe, to gaze therein on thee
Yet eyes this cunning want to grace their art
They draw but what they see, know not the hart.

1. **steeld**] *stell'd* C, A, Kt, Del, Hu, Dy, Sta, Gl, Kly, Cam, Do, R, Wh², Ty, Ox, Her, Be, Bull; *steled* B; *stel'd* Cl, Co³.
4. **perspectiue**] *perspective :* Wedmore conj.
5–6. **you . . . your**] *thou . . . thy* Stengel conj., Nicholson conj.
9. **good-turnes**] Hyphen omitted by G, etc.
11. **where-through**] *where through* 1640, G, S, E, R²; *wherethrough* Hu², N.

Dowden: The stage conceits in this sonnet are paralleled in Constable, *Diana* (1594), S. 5:

> Thine eye, the glass where I behold my heart,
> Mine eye, the window through the which thine eye
> May see my heart, and there thyself espy
> In bloody colours how thou painted art.

Cf. also Watson, *The Tears of Fancy* (1593), S. 45–46:

> My mistress seeing her fair counterfeit
> So sweetly framed in my bleeding breast . . .
> But it so fast was fixed to my heart, etc.

Cf. *L. L. L.*, V, ii, 848: "Behold the window of my heart, mine eye."

Isaac [also notes Daniel, *Delia*, S. 7, "I figured on the table of my heart"; Surrey, "I within my woful breast her picture paint and grave"; and a similar

passage in Tasso; with the comment, "The idea was therefore a current one." (*Jahrb.*, 17: 171–72.)] LEE: Ronsard's Ode (livre 4, No. 20) consists of a like dialogue between the heart and the eye. The conceit is traceable to Petrarch, whose Sonnet 55 or 63 ("Occhi, piangete, accompagnate il core") is a dialogue between the poet and his eyes, while his Sonnet 99 or 117 is a companion dialogue between the poet and his heart. Cf. Watson's *Tears of Fancy*, 19–20 ["My heart imposed this penance on mine eyes," and "My heart accused mine eyes and was offended"]; Drayton's *Idea*, 33 [on the Eyes and Heart envying each other]; Barnes, *P. & P.*, 20 ["These eyes (thy Beauty's tenants) pay due tears For occupation of mine heart, thy freehold"]; Constable, *Diana*, 6th Decade, S. 7 ["My heart mine eye accuseth of his death"]. (*Life*, p. 113.) BEECHING: This sonnet has the air of being a half-humorous, half-serious parody of a common type of sonnet.

WYNDHAM: The conceit begins with the poet's eye as a painter, who has drawn the friend's beauty on the poet's heart. It goes on to a play on the word "frame"; the body is the physiological *frame* which holds the heart and other organs, but, taking the other sense of frame, perspective, line 4, is the best of a painter's art; and, line 5, taking the etymological derivation of perspective with a reversion to the conceit that the friend's beauty is engraved on the poet's physical heart, to see the skill of the picture you must look through the painter = the poet's eye. The poet's bosom, line 7, being the shop wherein the picture hangs, has, line 8, borrowed the friend's eyes: making, line 9, a good exchange of "eyes for eyes." The poet's eyes, line 10, have been engaged in drawing the friend's shape; the friend's eyes, line 11, meanwhile have been windows, in their place, to the poet's breast, through which, line 12, the sun delights to peep, to gaze at the image of the friend. This is a conceit with a vengeance, but it does work out!

1. **steeld.** [The question of the text here is not a little complicated by a passage in *Lucrece*, 1444, "To find a face where all distress is steld," rhyming with "dwell'd," where also it is disputed whether we should read "steel'd" or "stell'd." The reference to this passage, therefore, by DOWDEN and others, in support of an alteration in the text of the sonnet, is far from final. Equally unconvincing is WYNDHAM'S defense of "steel'd" in the *Lucrece* passage by a reference to *V. & A.*, 376, where the word is used with the meaning "hardened" (the usual meaning in Sh.). There is no clear parallel for the use of the word with the meaning "engraved." On the other hand, for "stelled" we have but one parallel, *Lear*, III, vii, 61, "Quench'd the stelled fires," which Theobald derived from *stellatus*, but which SCHMIDT and FURNESS render "fixed" on the authority of the passages in *Lucrece* and this sonnet! Thus the circle of reasoning is complete. As to the rhyme with "held," cf. *field: held* in S. 2; BUTLER also notes such apparently imperfect rhymes as *noon: sun* (S. 7), *wrong: young* (S. 19), but here the question of pronunciation makes analogy inconclusive. — ED.] BEECHING: Engraving and painting are different arts, and in the passage in *Lucrece* . . . the word is again used of painting. Perhaps

it was a virtuoso's word. The parallel with *Lucrece* suggests an early date for the sonnet, which its style confirms. PORTER: The "table of my heart" would call for the tool to "steel" rather than "stell" it there. . . . The eye could better, like a painter or artist, draw "beauty's form" in the tablet of the heart than place it there as if in a portfolio. Line 10 confirms this.

2. MALONE: Cf. *A.W.*, I, i, 104–06:

> To sit and draw
> His arched brows, his hawking eye, his curls,
> In our heart's table.

ROLFE: Cf. *K.J.*, II, i, 503: "Drawn in the flattering table of her eye."

4. **perspective.** [SCHMIDT cites the passage under the common Elizabethan meaning, "a glass cut in such a manner as to produce an optical deception, when looked through." Cf. *R. 2*, II, ii, 18, etc.] DOWDEN: A painter's highest art is to produce the illusion of distance, one thing seeming to lie behind another. You must look *through* the painter (my eye or myself) to see your picture, the product of his skill, which lies within him (in my heart). TYLER: As used here, the meaning of the word appears to be "capability of being looked through." . . . Yet there is a reference also to the ordinary employment of the word in relation to pictorial art. BUTLER [interprets the word as Schmidt does, and is led to comment:] That Sh. could call such a trick as this "best painter's art" shows that in matters of painting he was profoundly ignorant. [Reference to the *N. E. D.* will show that the modern meaning of the word was common also in Sh.'s time; cf. especially, from Haydocke's translation of Lomazzo (1598), "A painter without the perspectives was like a doctor without grammar." — ED.]

5. VERITY: Literally: to see the picture painted in my heart you must look through my eye, the eye being the window of the heart; metaphorically: to appreciate properly a painter's work you should regard it with the eyes of the painter himself. [A valuable idea, but scarcely pertinent to the present sonnet. — ED.]

5–6. **you . . . your.** [The only instance where the pronoun of address to the friend is apparently changed inside a sonnet; see note on S. 13. — ED.] DOWDEN: May not *you* and *your* be used indefinitely, not with reference to the person addressed, but to what is of common application, as in "Your marriage comes by destiny," *A.W.*, I, iii, 66. [This explanation had occurred to me independently, and I have tried to cherish it; but to do so is made difficult by the fact that the only instances we have in Sh. of the indefinite *you* are distinctly colloquial — usually on rather a low level, even at that; the instance quoted by Dowden is from a doggerel ballad. Another difficulty is that "your image" seems to have distinct reference to the image of the friend. It should be added that in 104, 12–13 is another change of pronoun, though in this case not with reference to the poet's friend. — ED.] [My friend Professor H. D. GRAY remarks:] I think we are fully warranted in emending the text to read "thy true image." Sh.'s extreme care in his use of the pronouns of address

makes it much less likely that he should have been so needlessly careless here than that some copyist made the natural enough mistake of writing "your" for "thy."

11. **windowes.** [For the use of this word for the eyes, VERITY cites *L. L. L.*, V, ii, 848; *V. & A.*, 482; *R. & J.*, IV, i, 100; *Cymb.*, II, ii, 22; and similar passages from Dekker, Sidney, and the author of *Diella*.]

14. **know not the hart.** TYLER: Intimating possibly a suspicion in accordance with the last lines of S. 22.

25

LET those who are in fauor with their stars,
Of publike honour and proud titles bost,
Whilst I whome fortune of such tryumph bars
Vnlookt for ioy in that I honour most;
Great Princes fauorites their faire leaues spread,
But as the Marygold at the suns eye,
And in them-selues their pride lies buried,
For at a frowne they in their glory die.
The painefull warrier famosed for worth,
After a thousand victories once foild,
Is from the booke of honour rased quite,
And all the rest forgot for which he toild:
Then happy I that loue and am beloued
Where I may not remoue, nor be remoued.

4. **Vnlookt for**] *Unlook'd on* Sta conj.; *Unhonour'd* Sta conj., But.

9–11. **famosed for worth . . . rased quite**] *for worth famosed . . . quite rased* Stee conj. **worth . . . quite**] *worth . . . forth* Th conj., Kly, Wh^{1}, Co^{3}; *might . . . quite* C; *fight . . . quite* Th conj., M, A, Kt, Co^{1,2}, B, Del, Hu, Dy, Sta, Cl, Gl, Hal, Cam, Do, R, Wh^{2}, Ox, etc.

1–4. MASSEY: Sh. tells us indirectly that his young friend is not in favour . . . with Fortune, nor the recipient of public honours. (p. 110.) BUTLER: [The sonnet expresses joy] that Sh., and apparently Mr. W. H. as well, do not move in an exalted sphere. TYLER: Cf. Sonnets 29, 36, 111.

4. C. A. BROWN: This is evidence that the noble youth had sought an acquaintance with Sh., and proffered his friendship. (p. 61.) MASSEY: The young earl first sought out the poet, and conferred on him an unexpected honour: a joy "unlooked for." (p. 60.) WYNDHAM: Not distinguished as a fa-

vourite was said to be "distinguished" by a look or word from his sovereign. BEECHING: Probably an adverbial usage [of *unlook'd*], meaning: contrary to general usage, "most people joy in being honoured, I in honouring." BUTLER: Bearing in mind the carelessness with which this sonnet was printed in l. 9, and Sh.'s great love of antithesis, I have ventured to adopt Staunton's bold conjecture ["unhonour'd"]. HORACE DAVIS: "Unlookt for"=inconspicuous.

5–12. MALONE: Cf. *H. 8*, III, ii, 352–58:

> This is the state of man: to-day he puts forth
> The tender leaves of hopes; to-morrow blossoms, . . .
> The third day comes a frost, a killing frost, etc.

WYNDHAM: If, as to me seems probable, the earlier sonnets were written in 1599, no lines could have been penned more apposite than [these] to the fall and disgrace of Essex after his military failure in Ireland.

6. **Marygold.** DOWDEN: The garden marigold or Ruddes (*calendula officinalis*) . . . turns its flowers to the sun, and follows his guidance in their opening and shutting. The old name is goldes; it was the heliotrope, solsequium, or turnesol of our forefathers. (Condensed from Ellacombe's *Plant Lore of Sh.*) ROLFE: Cf. Wither:

> When with a serious musing I behold
> The grateful and obsequious marigold,
> How duly every morning she displays
> Her open breast when Phœbus spreads his rays; . . .
> How when he down declines she droops and mourns, etc.

9. **worth.** MALONE: The emendation [*fight*] was suggested by Mr. Theobald, who likewise proposed, if "worth" was retained, to read "razed *forth*." STEEVENS, [in proposing his cacophonous emendation, observed urbanely:] This stanza is not worth the labour that has been bestowed on it. COLLIER [preferred the reading *worth . . . forth*, though he did not care to] disturb the text as it has stood for a century. [MASSEY and INGLEBY express the same preference, the latter observing, "*Forth* is precisely our modern *out*," and, for worth = *virtus*, citing *L. L. L.*, I, i, 173: "the worth of many a knight." (*The Soule Arayed*, p. 6.)] B. NICHOLSON: I believe that Sh., led partly by alliteration, but chiefly by the natural sequence of such a word after "warrior" and before line 10, first wrote "fight," but afterwards, seeing that "rased forth" was more emphatic than "rased quite," altered "fight" to "worth," but (he or his copier) omitted to change the "quite" to "forth." (*N. & Q.*, 7th s., 5: 62.)

11. MALONE: Cf. *R. 2*, II, iii, 75: "To raze one title of your honour out."

13–14. BEECHING: This final couplet points emphatically the general impression given by the sonnet that Sh.'s friend was not himself a "great prince's favourite."

14. **remove.** DOWDEN, [in one of the most painful of his efforts to find links between the successive sonnets as they stand, finds here an anticipation of the journey of S. 26: Sh.] rejoices to think that at least in one place he has a fixed

abode. [For the punctuation, see P. SIMPSON'S note on 12, 14. This line, he remarks, is] similar in rhythm and equally spoilt by modern editors. (p. 24.)

[VON MAUNTZ, not finding in this sonnet anything applicable to a particular person, believes that it has for its subject the poet's art or genius.]

26

LORD of my loue, to whome in vassalage
Thy merrit hath my dutie strongly knit;
To thee I send this written ambassage
To witnesse duty, not to shew my wit.
Duty so great, which wit so poore as mine
May make seeme bare, in wanting words to shew it;
But that I hope some good conceipt of thine
In thy soules thought (all naked) will bestow it:
Til whatsoeuer star that guides my mouing,
Points on me gratiously with faire aspect,
And puts apparrell on my tottered louing,
To show me worthy of their sweet respect,
Then may I dare to boast how I doe loue thee,
Til then, not show my head where thou maist proue me

3. ambassage] *embassage* G², S², E, C, M, A, Kt, Co, B, Del, Hu, Dy, Sta, Cl, Gl, Kly, Wh, Hal, R, Her.
5. which] *with* S¹.
8. thy] *my* S, E.
9. my] *by* Kly [error?].
11. tottered] *tattered* S, etc. (except Bull, Wa).
12. their] *thy* C, M, etc.
13. dare] *dear* S¹.

---

*CAPELL [compared the first quatrain of this sonnet with the phrasing of the Dedication to *Lucrece*.] BOSWELL: This note, I imagine, suggested to Dr. Drake his theory that the Sonnets were addressed to Lord Southampton. DRAKE [at any rate noted the resemblance as proof of his theory:] In the first place, it may be observed that in his prose, as well as in his verse, our author uses the same amatory language; . . . while the residue tells us, in exact conformity with the prose address, his high sense of His Lordship's merit and his own unworthiness. (*Sh. & his Times*, 2: 63–64.) [The Dedication is as follows:]

"To the Right Honourable, Henry Wriothesley, Earle of Southampton, and Baron of Titchfield. The love I dedicate to your Lordship is without end: wherof this Pamphlet without beginning is but a superfluous Moity. The warrant I have of your Honourable disposition, not the worth of my untutord Lines makes it assured of acceptance. What I have done is yours, what I have to doe is yours, being part in all I have, devoted yours. Were my worth greater, my duety would shew greater, meane time, as it is, it is bound to your Lordship; To whom I wish long life still lengthned with all happinesse.

"Your Lordships in all duety. William Shakespeare."

KNIGHT: A dedication, accompanying some new production of the mighty dramatist, in accordance with his declaration, "What I have done is yours, what I have to do is yours." . . . The sonnet which precedes this has also the marked character of the same respectful affection, and, like the 26th, in all probability accompanied some offering of friendship. (*Illustration*, p. 470.) DELIUS: A dedication sonnet to one of higher rank, with whom the poet speaks in a wholly different tone — although in one as affectionate as respectful — from that of the supposed exhortations to marriage. (*Jahrb.*, 1: 41.) MASSEY: This was written and sent in MS. to the friend addressed, before the writer had published anything, that is, before the year 1593. . . . The dedication to the *V. & A.* is in part fulfilment of the intentions expressed [here.] In fact we see the sonnet was as much a private dedication of the poet's first poem, as this epistle was afterwards the public one. (pp. 36, 48.) ISAAC [finds the sonnet very different in tone from the Dedication of *Lucrece:*] Nothing could show more clearly the difference between the language that one uses to a noble patron and that to a friend, than a comparison of these two dedications. As ceremonially, constrainedly, in as utter submissiveness, as in the Dedication to *Lucrece*, one addressed his patron in that age; as intimately, with such self-abandon, often as finely, as in S. 26, one addressed a friend in those days — and in every age. (*Jahrb.*, 19: 242.) LORD CAMPBELL [refers to the sonnet as] a love-letter, in the language of a vassal doing homage to his liege-lord. (*Sh.'s Legal Acquirements*, p. 101.) TYLER: Drake's argument [from the resemblance to the Dedication] that it is Lord Southampton who is here addressed also, is certainly not conclusive. We have, however, obviously a colouring of plausibility given to the assertion that Mr. W. H. was a person of somewhat similarly high station. SARRAZIN: It is scarcely too bold to assume that this poem accompanied the MS. of *Lucrece*, and was therefore composed about the spring of 1594. (*Sh.'s Lehrjahre*, p. 170.) ARCHER: [The resemblance proves nothing but] that even in the mind of Sh. similar situations begot similar expressions. (*Fort. Rev.*, n.s. 62: 825.) LEE: A gorgeous rendering of [the Dedication, addressed to Southampton.] . . . There is little doubt that this sonnet was parodied by Sir John Davies in the 9th and last of his "gulling" sonnets, in which he ridicules the notion that a man of wit should put his wit in vassalage to any one.

To love my lord I do knight's service owe,
And therefore now he hath my wit in ward; [etc.]

(*Life*, pp. 127, 128 n.)

BEECHING: [This] is possible, though, considering the excesses in this respect of *Zepheria*, to which Davies refers by name, it is uncertain. [He goes on to show that the date of Davies's sonnets is uncertain, and therefore, even if the resemblance is significant, we are not helped in the problem of dating Sh.'s.] (Intro., p. xxvii n.)

WALSH: [Cf. one of Spenser's dedicatory sonnets prefixed to the *F. Q.*, addressed to Lord Grey of Wilton:

> Most noble lord, the pillar of my life,
> And patron of my Muse's pupillage,
> Through whose large bounty, poured on me rife,
> In the first season of my feeble age,
> I now do live, bound yours by vassalage; etc.]

. . . It is quite possible that this sonnet was a private dedication written in the presentation copy [of *Lucrece*] sent to Southampton. . . . For sake of comparison it is noteworthy that Spenser's dedicatory sonnet to the Countess of Pembroke, among those prefixed to his *F. Q.*, was little else than a poetical version of his prose dedication to her of his *Ruins of Time*.

C. A. BROWN [made this sonnet the "envoy" to what he called the "first poem" of the series, i.e., 1–26. The same conjecture is proposed by DOWDEN, TYLER, ACHESON (*Sh. & the Rival Poet*, p. 31), and T. L. M. DOUSE, who writes as follows:] This sonnet was sent as an envoi, or covering note, with 1–25, to the addressee, who had evidently laid on the poet a charge . . . that he would produce a poem or poems on a given subject. This charge the poet has taken up and executed, and so fulfilled a thrice-named *duty*. . . . [It is obvious] that the addressee was a man of sufficient station and authority to secure the execution of his wishes; also that Sh. was but slightly acquainted with him, although he hopes to be on friendly terms some day; also that Sonnets 1–25 were pure poetry, so that the poet fears they may be taken as a mere exercise of his cleverness. (*N. & Q.*, 10th s., 2: 133.) [On the other hand, WYNDHAM treats the sonnet as "a formal address" opening the sequence 26–32 (Intro., p. cx); BUTLER is disposed to think it accompanied "the six next following sonnets"; and BEECHING makes it the opening sonnet of its group, called "Thoughts in Absence."]

2. STEEVENS: Cf. *Macb.*, III, i, 15–18:

> Let your Highness
> Command upon me; to the which my duties
> Are with a most indissoluble tie
> For ever knit.

4. **wit.** SCHMIDT [does not cite the present passage; but it falls under his definition:] imaginative and inventive faculty.

7. **conceipt.** [See note on 15, 9; and note how the spelling here preserves the relationship of the word to "concept." — ED.]

8. **all naked.** DOWDEN: My duty, even naked as it is. **bestow.** SCHMIDT:

Lodge. TYLER: [The word] here seems to mean not merely "lodge," but also "equip" and "clothe."

9. **whatsoever . . . that.** ABBOTT [explains this construction as an ellipsis of "it be." (§286).] **moving.** SCHMIDT: Living. TYLER: The poet, it would appear, in accordance with following sonnets, is about to commence a journey. BEECHING: There need be no reference in this word to any journey, since it is a general expression for life, as in the phrase "to live, and move, and have our being;" but the word is common in Sh. of the "motion" of heavenly bodies, and in one or two places it is used of the movements of men under their influence. Thus . . . *A.W.*, II, i, 56: "Eat, speak, and move under the influence of the most received star." So that "moving" here may imply journeying. In the former case the sonnet may be taken as envoy to what precedes, in the latter as proem to what follows.

11. ACHESON [finds here a reference to the grant of arms received by Sh. on application to the College of Heralds in 1596. (*Sh. & the Rival Poet*, p. 119.)] **tottered.** See note on 2, 4.

12. **their.** MALONE: For the correction [to "thy"] I am answerable. The same mistake has several times happened in these sonnets, owing probably to abbreviations having been formerly used for the words "their" and "thy," so nearly resembling each other as not to be easily distinguished. I have observed the same error in some of the old English plays. [The other instances usually corrected are in 27, 10; 35, 8; 37, 7; 43, 11; 45, 12; 46, 3, 8, 13, 14; 69, 5; 70, 6; 128, 11, 14. — ED.] WYNDHAM, [always disposed to save the Q reading if he can, observes:] It is possible that "their" may be the right reading, referring to the stars, suggested by "whatsoever star" in line 9; [and Miss PORTER, who defends the Q to the death — of reason, believes that "their" refers to "the sweet respect of the *star* and *thy soules thought*."]

13–14. DOWDEN: The rhyme has an echo of Daniel's *Delia*, S. 10:

> Once let her know! sh' hath done enough to prove me,
> And let her pity, if she cannot love me.

[VON MAUNTZ compares with this sonnet Ovid's *Ex Ponto*, IV, i, 19–21:

> Idque sinas oro, nec fastidita repellas
> Verba nec officio crimen inesse putes;
> Et levis haec meritis referatur gratia tantis.]

27

WEARY with toyle, I hast me to my bed,
The deare repose for lims with trauaill tired,
But then begins a iourny in my head
To worke my mind, when boddies work's expired.
For then my thoughts (from far where I abide)
Intend a zelous pilgrimage to thee;
And keepe my drooping eye-lids open wide,
Looking on darknes which the blind doe see.
Saue that my soules imaginary sight
Presents their shaddoe to my sightles view,
Which like a iewell (hunge in gastly night)
Makes blacke night beautious, and her old face new.
Loe thus by day my lims, by night my mind,
For thee, and for my selfe, noe quiet finde.

2. **trauaill**] *travel* G², S², etc. (except But).
3. **head**] *head*, G², S², etc. (except Do, Ox).
5. **from far**] *far from* G, S, E, M conj.
10. **their**] *thy* C, M, etc.

MASSEY: [This and the following sonnet pertain to the journey and absence abroad, spoken of in 44–45, 50, 61. (p. 91.)] ISAAC [puts the pair in a group of *Reiselieder* with 43–48, 50–51, 61, 97–99, 113–114, and believes they are connected with a hypothetical journey to Italy. (*Jahrb.*, 19: 209.)] [For FLEAY's notion that all these "absence" or "travel" sonnets refer not to any actual journey, but to the separation between Southampton and Sh. caused by the supposed unfaithfulness of the latter, see *Macm. Mag.*, 31: 435.]

[For the theme of the two sonnets MASSEY compares Sidney, *A. & S.*, 89:

> Now that of absence the most irksome night
> With darkest shade doth overcome my day,
> Since Stella's eyes, wont to give me my day,
> Leaving my hemisphere, leave me in night; etc. (p. 77.)

And ISAAC notes also Sidney's 88 ("Out! traitor Absence!"), 98 ("Ah, bed! . . . I am constrained, spurred with Love's spur, . . . to turn and toss in thee!"), and 99 ("When far-spent night persuades each mortal eye"); Daniel, S. 49 (the well-known "Care-charmer Sleep"); two sonnets of Surrey's (2 and 10, Nott ed.); and various poems of Petrarch's (Pt. 1, Canzone 4; S. 161, 168, 178).

(*Jahrb.*, 17: 191.)] LEE: Sh. in many beautiful sonnets describes . . . night and sleep and their influence on amorous emotion. Such topics are common themes of the poetry of the Renaissance, and they figure in Sh.'s pages clad in the identical livery that clothed them in the sonnets of Petrarch, Ronsard, de Baif, and Desportes, or of English disciples of the Italian and French masters. . . . For descriptions of night and sleep see especially Ronsard's *Amours* (livre 1, 186; livre 2, 22; *Odes*, livre 4, No. 4, and his *Odes Retranchées*, in *Œuvres*, ed. Blanchemain, 2: 392–4). Cf. Barnes, *P. & P.*, S. 83 ["Dark night! black image of my foul despair!"] (*Life*, pp. 111–12.)

3. **head.** DOWDEN: Modern editors put a comma after "head." But is not the construction "a journey in my head begins to work my mind"?

3–4. [An anonymous writer in *Blackwood's*, 139: 335, compares Dante, *Purgatorio*, ii, 11–12:

> Like men who, musing on their road, in thought
> Journey, while motionless the body stands.]

6. **Intend.** SCHMIDT: Direct. DOWDEN: Used frequently of travel. Cf. *M. W. W.*, II, i, 188: "If he should intend this voyage toward my wife."

7–8. MASSEY: [Cf. Sidney, *A. & S.*, 99:

> With windows ope then [i.e., at night] most my mind doth lie,
> Viewing the shape of darkness and delight.]

(p. 147.)

9. **imaginary.** ROLFE: Imaginative. Cf. *K.J.*, IV, ii, 265: "Foul imaginary eyes."

10. **their.** [See note on 26, 12. Again WYNDHAM thinks it possible, and Miss PORTER certain, that the word should be kept, referring to "my thoughts."] **shaddoe.** SCHMIDT: Image produced by the imagination. [Cf. 37, 10, and notes. — ED.]

11–12. MALONE: Cf. *R. & J.*, I, v, 47–48:

> Her beauty hangs upon the cheek of night
> Like a rich jewel in an Ethiop's ear

[the reading of the 2d Folio].

12. For the rhythm, see note on 5, 7.

13–14. DOWDEN: By day my limbs find no quiet for myself, i.e., on account of business of my own; by night my mind finds no quiet for thee, i.e., on your account, thinking of you. ROLFE: For the interlaced or "chiastic" construction . . . cf. *W.T.*, III, ii, 164: "Though I with death and with reward did threaten and encourage him"; and S. 75, 11–12.

BRANDL [thinks that this sonnet and 28 were addressed to a woman. (p. x.)].

28

How can I then returne in happy plight
That am debard the benifit of rest ?
When daies oppression is not eazd by night,
But day by night and night by day oprest.
And each (though enimes to ethers raigne)
Doe in consent shake hands to torture me,
The one by toyle, the other to complaine
How far I toyle, still farther off from thee.
I tell the Day to please him thou art bright,
And do'st him grace when clouds doe blot the heauen:
So flatter I the swart complexiond night,
When sparkling stars twire not thou guil'st th' eauen.
But day doth daily draw my sorrowes longer,
And night doth nightly make greefes length seeme stronger

5. **ethers**] *others* 1640, L, G, S, E; *either's* M, etc.

8. **farther**] *further* Hu, Ox.

9. **to please him**] Between commas G^2, S, E, M, A, Kt, B, Hu, Dy, Sta, Cl, Kly, Do, Ty, But, Be.

12. **twire**] *twire*, 1640; *tweer* G, S, E; *twirl* M conj.; *twink* Stee conj.; *tire* Massey conj. **not**] *out*, G, S, E. **guil'st**] *guild'st* G^2, S^1; *gild'st* S^2, etc.

13–14. **longer . . . length seeme stronger**] *stronger . . . length seem longer* anon. conj. (in M); *longer . . . strength seem stronger* C, Kt, Del, Dy, $Co^{2\beta}$), Sta, Gl, Kly, Wh, Cam, Hu^2, R, But, Ox, Her, Be, Bull, Wa.

1–2. WYNDHAM: The marked query in these two lines suggests that they are a rejoinder to some kindly expression of good wishes for the poet's happy return in a letter from the friend.

9. [Despite the rather important difference of editorial practice in the punctuation of this line, determining whether "to please him" is the reason why "I tell the day" or why "thou art bright," the matter has escaped discussion. The weight of opinion is shown by the textual notes to favor the former, — reading "to please him" between commas, — doubtless for the reason that the context suggests that the phrase is parallel with "flatter": I console the day, when it is cloudy, as I flatter the night when it is starless. It is possible, however, to read the two sentences as parallel, and still suppose that "thou art bright" with the friendly purpose of pleasing the day. — ED.]

12. MASSEY: Cf. *M. N. D.*, III, ii, 187–88:

> Fair Helena, that more engilds the night
> Than all yon fiery oes and eyes of light. (p. 88.)

twire. STEEVENS [following Tyrwhitt's interpretation of the word in Chaucer's version of Boethius, thought that it might mean "sing," — if not a corruption of "twink."] BOSWELL: In Jonson's *Sad Shepherd* this word occurs: "Which maids will twire at 'tween their fingers thus." Mr. Gifford, in a note on that passage (*Works*, vi, 280), produces several instances of the word in our ancient writers, and explains the expression in the text thus: "When the stars do not gleam or appear at intervals." To *twire* seems to have much the same significance as to *peep*. [This explanation has been generally accepted, except by MASSEY, who reverted to the Chaucerian meaning, explaining, however, that the word "is employed for visible motion as well as audible," and hence is applicable to the quivering light of the stars. He also believed that the image was suggested to Sh. by Sidney's conceit (*A. & S.*, 38) that his Stella "not only shines but sings." (p. 148.)]

13–14. MALONE: [*Capell] proposes to make the two concluding words of this couplet to change places. But I believe the old copy to be right. "Stronger" cannot well apply to *drawn out* or *protracted* sorrow. [In his MS. corrections, it will be noticed, Capell made the alternative emendation which has been followed by many editors. — ED.] DELIUS, [supporting this emendation ("strength" for "length"), calls attention to *2 H. 4*, II, iii, 55:

> Then join you with them, like a rib of steel,
> To make strength stronger.]

DOWDEN: [If we keep the Q text, it means: The drawing-out of my sorrows does not weaken them,] for my night-thoughts come to make my sorrows as strong as before, nay stronger. It might be supposed that my grief if long were light, but this is not so; it grows in length indeed each day, but also to this length is added strength each night. [This is followed by WYNDHAM, with more assurance. BEECHING favors the emendation, because] it is best to continue the division of the poet's woe between day and night — to the day length of journey, to the night strength of complaint. [I have no doubt that the emendation is justified, if any is justified except to avoid absolute nonsense. — ED.]

29

When in disgrace with Fortune and mens eyes,
I all alone beweepe my out-cast state,
And trouble deafe heauen with my bootlesse cries,
And looke vpon my selfe and curse my fate.
Wishing me like to one more rich in hope,
Featur'd like him, like him with friends possest,
Desiring this mans art, and that mans skope,
With what I most inioy contented least,
Yet in these thoughts my selfe almost despising,
Haplye I thinke on thee, and then my state,
(Like to the Larke at breake of daye arising)
From sullen earth sings himns at Heauens gate,
For thy sweet loue remembred such welth brings,
That then I skorne to change my state with Kings.

9. **Yet**] *Yea* Sta conj.

10–12. **state, (Like . . . arising) From sullen earth**] *state, Like . . . arising From sullen earth*, G², S², E, B, Hu, Gl, Dy², Cam, Do, R, Wh², Ty, Ox, Her, Be, N, Bull; *state — Like . . . arising From sullen earth, —* C; *state* (*Like . . . arising From sullen earth*) M, A, Kt, Co, Del, Dy¹, Sta, Cl, Wh¹; *state — Like . . . arising From sullen earth —* Kly, Hal; *state, (Like . . . arising) From sullen earth*, Wy; *state Like . . . arising From sullen earth*, But; *state, Like . . . arising, From sullen earth* Wa.

12. **earth**] *earths* G¹. **sings himns**] *to sing* G², S², E.

Malone: These nervous and animated lines, in which such an assemblage of thoughts, clothed in the most glowing expressions, is compressed into the narrow compass of fourteen lines, might, I think, have saved the whole of this collection from the general and indiscriminate censure thrown out against them by Mr. Steevens.

Massey: [Cf. with this and S. 30 Sidney, *A. & S.*, 18:

With what sharp checks I in myself am shent,
When into Reason's audit I do go;
And by just counts, myself a bankrupt know
Of all those goods which heaven to me hath lent; (etc.)

and *ibid.*, 64:

Let Fortune lay on me her worst disgrace!
Let folk o'ercharged with brain against me cry. (p. 76.)]

TYLER: This sonnet, with its mention of Sh.'s "outcast state," etc., would be very suitable to the supposition that he was on a provincial tour as an actor. LEE: The sonnets in which [Sh.] . . . gives expression to a sense of melancholy, offer at times a convincing illusion of autobiographic confessions. . . . But they may be, on the other hand, merely literary meditations. . . . Almost every note in the scale of sadness or self-reproach is sounded from time to time in Petrarch's sonnets. Tasso in *Scelta delle Rime*, 1582, pt. 2, p. 26, has a sonnet (beginning "Vinca fortuna homai, se sotto il peso") which adumbrates Sh.'s Sonnets 29 and 66. . . . Drummond's Sonnets 25 ("What cruel star into this world was brought") and 32 ("If crost with all mishaps be my poor life") are pitched in the identical key. (*Life*, p. 152.) [This is an example of the sort of comparative criticism of the Sonnets which has repeatedly vexed the souls of those who cherish great admiration for the writer's learning. The source of the vexation is, in part at least, the implication that that which has been abundantly uttered by others is not likely to be uttered anew in personal sincerity. If this were so, what should true lovers and honest sufferers do? The attitude of Sir Sidney Lee is, from one standpoint, a wholesome reaction against the sort of biographic interpretation represented by the note of Tyler, quoted above, which assumes that Sh. could not have written this sonnet except under the stress of some particular situation. But it is a long way from this extreme to the other, — the inference that Sh. was not voicing his own disappointments because the Renaissance poets generally had chosen the sonnet in which to voice theirs. The fallacy lurks in the phrase "literary meditation"; is a literary meditation a mere imitation? — ED.]

1. **Fortune.** [The capital initial here has been very generally, and I think wrongly, omitted by modern editors, doubtless under the influence of the Malone and the Cambridge editions. (Exceptions are the texts of Wyndham, Butler, Neilson, and a few others.) Surely the importance of the personification of Fortune in Elizabethan literature raises a presumption of its being found here. — ED.]

3. [ABBOTT scans this line rather sadly, treating "trouble" as an instance of the contraction of dissyllables in *l*, and "heaven" as dissyllabic. (§ 465.) It is surely preferable to read "deaf heav'n" with "hovering accent." — ED.]

5–7. LAMB: [Thus could Sh.] in the plenitude and consciousness of his own powers, . . . with that noble modesty which we can neither imitate nor appreciate, express himself . . . of his own sense of his own defects. (*Essay on The Tragedies of Sh.*)

8. DOWDEN: The preceding line makes it not improbable that Sh. is here speaking of his own poems.

10–12. [The various editions, while exhibiting great diversity of detail in the punctuation of these lines, are — it will be noticed — in pretty general agreement in removing the stop after "arising." In addition to Wyndham and Walsh, PERCY SIMPSON holds to the dubious construction of the Q, and maintains that editors have no right to move the second mark of parenthesis three

words further on. "It breaks a subtle link with the thought of the opening lines and impoverishes the beauty of the simile to detach [the poet's] 'state' from the 'sullen earth.'" (p. 93.) This is what might be called transcendental punctuation. If followed, we must read, in effect, "My state from sullen earth sings hymns at heaven's gate," which suggests a use of *at* like that in the phrase "shouted at him." What the lark does, at any rate, is not to sing from sullen earth, but to rise from it, and it seems safer to follow the maker of the simile than the printer of the parentheses. — ED.]

MALONE: Cf. *Cymb.*, II, iii, 21–22:

> Hark! hark! the lark at heaven's gate sings,
> And Phoebus gins arise.

. . . Perhaps, as Mr. Reed has observed, Sh. remembered Lilly's *Campaspe* (1584):

> None but the lark so shrill and clear;
> Now at heaven's gate she claps her wings.

30

WHEN to the Sessions of sweet silent thought,
I sommon vp remembrance of things past,
I sigh the lacke of many a thing I sought,
And with old woes new waile my deare times waste:
Then can I drowne an eye (vn-vs'd to flow)
For precious friends hid in deaths dateles night,
And weepe a fresh loues long since canceld woe,
And mone th'expence of many a vannisht sight.
Then can I greeue at greeuances fore-gon,
And heauily from woe to woe tell ore
The sad account of fore-bemoned mone,
Which I new pay, as if not payd before.
But if the while I thinke on thee (deare friend)
All losses are restord, and sorrowes end.

4. **woes**] *woes'* Kock conj. **times**] *time's* G², S, E, M, Co, etc. (except Ox); *times'* A, Kt, Ox.

8. **th'expence**] *the expence* C, M, A, Kt, B, Del, Cl, Gl, Kly, Cam, Do, R, Wh², Ty, Ox, But, Her, Be, N.

1. **Sessions.** [For the legal metaphor, MALONE compares] *Oth.*, III, iii, 138–41:

Who has a breast so pure
But some uncleanly apprehensions
Keep leets and law-days and in sessions sit
With meditations lawful?

4. [Note the remarkably spondaic rhythm. — Ed.] Palgrave: Cf. Καινοῖς παλαιὰ δακρύοις στένειν κακά. [Apparently a misquotation, as Professor W. A. Oldfather brings to my attention, of a passage attributed to Euripides (see Nauck, *Trag. Graec. Fragm.*, fragment 43). — Ed.] **deare times waste.** Tyler: The things or persons devastated or destroyed by Time, which were dear to me. [Rolfe seems to favor this interpretation, in the paraphrase, "Those dear to me now gone." I cannot think, however, that "my time's waste" should be so read. Is it not that his time has been wasted, in a sense, in seeking (line 3) the things which he now lacks, — that all his life has been wasted in the same tragic accumulation of what are now "vanisht sights"? — Ed.] E. A. Kock [(*Anglia*, 31: 133) would take "wail" as a noun and "waste" as a verb, paraphrasing: "And spend my precious moments in the fresh bewailing of old woes."]

6. **dateles.** Schmidt: Eternal. Cf. 153, 6.

8. **expence.** Schmidt: Loss; cf. 129, 1. [So Rolfe, Beeching, etc.] Dowden: Does not "moan the expense" mean "pay my account of moans for"? Tyler: Moan over what the loss of "precious friends" cost me in sorrow. [As appears from my note on "time's waste," I am disposed to agree with Tyler's note here, only with the emphasis on the whole weary experience, rather than the mere final loss. — Ed.] **sight.** Steevens: Many an object which, being gone hence, is no more seen. Malone: *Sight* seems to be here used for "sigh," by the same license which Sh. has already employed in his *Lucrece*, writing "hild" instead of "held," "than" instead of "then," etc. . . . The substantive "sigh" was in our author's time pronounced so hard, that in one of the old copies of *1 H. 4*, Q 1599, we have: "And with a rising *sight* he wisheth you in heaven." Delius: Image (*Bild*). Beeching: We speak of friends as being "lost to (our) sight." Sh. calls each of them a "lost sight."

10. Rolfe: In this line and the next, note the lingering sadness of the long o's. **tell.** Schmidt: Count. Cf. 138, 12.

13. **friend.** Massey [notes that this is the first of the sonnets to use this form of address, which he holds to be characteristic of lovers, in Elizabethan use, — a stronger term, or more associated with love between the sexes, than the "love" of 22, 9, etc. In support he cites a love-letter written by Sir George Hayward, 1550, beginning "My dearest friend"; a lover in one of Dekker's plays, apostrophizing his lady's portrait as "thou figure of my friend"; Surrey, calling his lady "my friend"; Beatrice of Benedick, "I must ne'er love that which my friend hates"; Lucio of Claudio, "He hath got his friend with child"; Hermia to her lover, "Gentle friend"; and others. On the other hand, in Sonnets 1–26, clearly addressed by a man to one of the same sex, the title "love" is used seven times, and "friend" not at all. (p. 123.)]

31

Thy bosome is indeared with all hearts,
Which I by lacking haue supposed dead,
And there raignes Loue and all Loues louing parts,
And all those friends which I thought buried.
How many a holy and obsequious teare
Hath deare religious loue stolne from mine eye,
As interest of the dead, which now appeare,
But things remou'd that hidden in there lie.
Thou art the graue where buried loue doth liue,
Hung with the tropheis of my louers gon,
Who all their parts of me to thee did giue,
That due of many, now is thine alone.
Their images I lou'd, I view in thee,
And thou (all they) hast all the all of me.

6. **deare religious**] Hyphened by Walker conj., Sta, Dy², Hu².
8. **there**] *thee* G, etc. (except Wy, Wa).
11. **giue,**] *give;* S¹, M, A, Kt, Co, B, Del, Hu, Dy, Sta, Cl, Gl, Kly, Wh, Hal, Cam, Do, R¹, Ty, Wy, But, Bull, Wa; *give:* Her, Be.
14. **all the all**] Hyphened by Sta.

SIMPSON [finds in the theme of this sonnet a presentation of the Platonic view of love as lending itself] to many collateral objects without being false to its great object. It is a higher stage when all collateral, all inferior objects are summed up in the main object, and live a second life in him. (p. 34.) (Cf. note on 98, 11–12.) So WYNDHAM:] The mystical confusion with and in the friend of all that is beautiful or lovable in the poet and others, is a development from the Platonic theory of the Idea of Beauty: the eternal type of which all beautiful things on earth are but shadows. (Intro., p. cxviii.)

1–4. MASSEY: Cf. Sidney, *A. & S.*, 1st Song: "Who long dead beauty with increase reneweth?" (p. 76.)

5. **obsequious.** MALONE: Funereal; cf. *Haml.*, I, ii, 92:

> The survivor bound
> In filial obligation for some term
> To do obsequious sorrow.

[So DOWDEN, COLLIER, ROLFE, BEECHING, etc.; but TYLER renders "dutiful." There is hardly warrant for the rendering "funereal," either in the *Hamlet*

passage or here; though a special tendency in the word, in such connections, is doubtless rightly indicated by SCHMIDT ("especially zealous with respect to what is due to the deceased") and the *N. E. D.* ("dutiful in performing funeral obsequies"). — ED.]

6. **religious.** DOWDEN: Cf. *L. C.*, 250: "Religious love put out Religion's eye." SCHMIDT: Devoted to any holy obligation. [But, in the passages in question, "devoted" without the modifying words is a better rendering. — ED.] [WALKER, hyphenating the word with *deare*, explains, "Making a religion of its affections."]

7. **interest.** SCHMIDT: Right, claim. [Cf. 74, 3, where Schmidt renders the word "share, participation." The uses, however, are closely related; both being, in a sense, figurative from the primary meaning, "the relation of being objectively concerned in something, by having a right or title to, a claim upon, or a share in." (*N. E. D.*) Cf. *R. 3*, II, ii, 47:

> Ah, so much interest have I in thy sorrow
> As I had title in thy noble husband. — ED.]

8. **there.** MALONE: The next line shows clearly that [this reading] is corrupt. WYNDHAM: I retain the Q reading: "there" refers back to "thy bosom" (line 1); "and there" (line 3). Thus "hidden in there" = hidden in thy bosom. [Miss PORTER makes a similar painful effort to keep the text. It need hardly be remarked that Sh. would have written "therein" (as frequently), if the meaning had been that suggested. — ED.]

9. MCCLUMPHA: Cf. *R. & J.*, II, iii, 83:

> And bad'st me bury love.
> — Not in a grave. (*Jahrb.*, 40: 189.)

10. DOWDEN: Cf. *L. C.*, 218: "Lo, all these trophies of affections hot . . . must your oblations be."

11. **parts of me.** ROLFE: Shares in me, claims upon me.

11–12. [All the modern editors except Craig and Neilson put a strong stop after "give," doubtless interpreting the following "That" as demonstrative. Following the Q text, I explained "that" as "so that" in the Tudor edition; but I have no doubt that the usual corrected punctuation is right. Cf. 39, 8 and 69, 3, which make it practically certain that "That" is demonstrative; and it would be difficult to explain the use of "due" without pronoun or article. "That due of many" is apparently the substantial equivalent of the "interest of the dead." — ED.]

32

If thou suruiue my well contented daie,
When that churle death my bones with dust shall couer
And shalt by fortune once more re-suruay:
These poore rude lines of thy deceased Louer:
Compare them with the bett'ring of the time,
And though they be out-stript by euery pen,
Reserue them for my loue, not for their rime,
Exceeded by the hight of happier men.
Oh then voutsafe me but this louing thought,
Had my friends Muse growne with this growing age,
A dearer birth then this his loue had brought
To march in ranckes of better equipage:
But since he died and Poets better proue,
Theirs for their stile ile read, his for his loue.

4. **poore rude**] Hyphened by Walker conj.
9. **voutsafe**] *vouchsafe* 1640, G, etc.
10. **this**] *his* But.
10–14. **Had . . . loue**] Italics by M, A, Kly, Co^{3}; quoted by Kt, Co$^{1, 2}$, B, Del, Hu, Dy, Sta, Cl, Gl, Wh, Hal, Cam, Do, etc.

DOWDEN: This sonnet reads like an *envoy*. TYLER: Probably the envoy to the series 27–32. LEE: [This sonnet repeats the intimation of the Dedication of *Lucrece*] that the patron's love alone gives value to the poet's "untutored lines." (*Life*, p. 128.)

1. **well contented.** MASSEY: The poet calls his life a "well-contented day," in direct opposition to the malcontent who speaks in S. 29. (p. 111.) ROLFE: Possibly it refers to the love of his friend which . . . has made up for all the losses he has suffered. [Apparently Rolfe here follows the misinterpretation of Massey; surely the "well contented day" is the day of the poet's burial. — ED.]

4. **poore rude lines.** DELIUS: If any one seeks to learn from these poems the true heart-meaning of our poet, what — for example — Sh. thought of the worth of his sonnets, he will surely fall into some perplexity if he finds the same poems here called "poor rude lines" which in S. 18 were "eternal lines." (*Jahrb.*, 1: 41.) **Lover.** MALONE: It is proper to observe that such addresses to men were common in Sh.'s time, and were not thought indecorous. . . . We have many examples in our author's plays of the expression used in the sonnet before us, and afterwards frequently repeated. [Cf. *Cor.*, V, ii, 14: "I tell thee, fellow,

thy general is my lover"; the soothsayer in *J. C.*, II, iii, 9, "Thy lover, Artemidorus"; Ulysses in *T. & C.*, III, iii, 214, "I as your lover speak."] . . . In like manner Ben Jonson concludes one of his letters to Dr. Donne by telling him that he is his "ever true lover"; and Drayton, in a letter to Mr. Drummond of Hawthornden, informs him that Mr. Joseph Davies is *in love* with him.

5–6. DOWDEN: May we infer from these lines (and 10) that Sh. had a sense of the wonderful progress of poetry in the time of Elizabeth? ROLFE: The reference is probably to the general improvement that may be expected in the future.

7. **Reserve.** MALONE: Preserve. Cf. *Per.*, IV, i, 40: "Reserve that excellent complexion." PORTER: [Cf. Daniel's use of the word, in *Delia*, 41 (39, 1594 ed.)] with the same sense of cherishing aloof: . . .

> Thou may'st in after ages live esteemed,
> Unburied, in these lines, reserved in pureness.

10. MALONE: We may . . . infer that these were among our author's earliest compositions. [So DRAKE (2: 50), who compares "pupil pen" in 16, 10. BUTLER infers from Malone's comment that he intended his text to read "*his* growing age," a reading noted in Capell's MS. and then erased.]

12. TYLER: [Cf. Marston, *Pigmalion's Image*, 1598, where he speaks of his stanzas

> Which like soldados of our warlike age
> March rich bedight in warlike equipage.]

There is no great difficulty in perceiving that we have here in all probability the source of Sh.'s line. [Tyler thinks that the passage alludes to the contemporary popularity of Marston's poem, an attempt to rival *V. & A.*] (Intro., p. 37.) LEE: [The belief that this line was imitated from an expression of Marston's] is quite gratuitous. The phrase was common in Elizabethan literature long before Marston employed it. Nash, in his preface to Green's *Menaphon* (1589), wrote that the works of the poet Watson "march in equipage of honour with any of your ancient poets." (*Life*, p. 129 n.) PORTER: The mere elaboration without new application of the common metaphor by Marston tends to show that he is the borrower, and this is confirmed by all the external evidence there is as to dates of his work and Sh.'s Sonnets.

[A MS. copy of this sonnet (and S. 71) appears in a commonplace book "apparently kept by an Oxford student about 1633," which is described by Lee (*Sonnets*, facsimile ed., 1905, Intro., p. 53 n.) as in the possession of Mr. Marsden Perry, an American collector. From a transcript made for Lee it appears that the only variant reading in the text of the sonnet, aside from spelling, is "loue" for "birth" in line 11. The MS. book has now, unfortunately, passed from Mr. Perry's hands to those of a less generous owner, so that I have been unable to verify the transcript. — ED.]

33

Fvll many a glorious morning haue I seene,
Flatter the mountaine tops with soueraine eie,
Kissing with golden face the meddowes greene;
Guilding pale streames with heauenly alcumy:
Anon permit the basest cloudes to ride,
With ougly rack on his celestiall face,
And from the for-lorne world his visage hide
Stealing vnseene to west with this disgrace:
Euen so my Sunne one early morne did shine,
With all triumphant splendor on my brow,
But out alack, he was but one houre mine,
The region cloude hath mask'd him from me now.
Yet him for this, my loue no whit disdaineth,
Suns of the world may staine, whē heauens sun stainteh.

1. **haue I seene**] *sun I have seen* Kly conj.
4. **alcumy**:] *alchumy?* E.
8. **west**] *rest* Stee conj. **this**] *his* Walker conj., Hu², But.
10. **all triumphant**] Hyphened by Del, Hu, Dy, Sta, Gl, Cam, Do, R, Wh², Ox, etc.
12. **region cloude**] *regent cloud* B conj.; hyphened by Kly, Wh², N.
14. **stainteh**] *stayneth* 1640; *staineth* L, etc.

Delius: [In Sonnets 33–35] we are able to see only poetic variations on a point of incidence in the last scene of *T. G. V.* (*Jahrb.*, 1: 42.) Spalding: [From Sonnets 33–38 it is clear that the friend] has said or done something that has gone to Sh.'s heart like a knife. [This is not the intrigue of S. 40–42, but, as is suggested by 36–37, an unwillingness or refusal on the friend's part, perhaps taunted by his associates, to admit his friendship with Sh.] (*Gent. Mag.*, 242: 307.) Dowden: A new group seems to begin with this sonnet. It introduces the wrongs done to Sh. by his friend. Wyndham: The first of the more immediately personal garlands [forms the group 33–42]. . . . The biographical interest of this group has won it an undeserved attention at the expense of others. Many suppose that all the Sonnets turn on this theme, or, at least, that the loudest note of passion is here sounded. But this is not so. Of all ten three at the most can be called tragic. These are 34 — but it arises out of the lovely imagery of 33; 36 — but it ends,

I love thee in such sort
As thou being mine, mine is thy good report;

and 40, but it ends, "Yet we must not be foes." 33 is indeed beautiful, but the others return to the early theme of mere immortalising, or are expressed in abstruse or playful conceits which make it impossible to believe they mirror a soul in pain. . . . Knowing what Sh. can do to express anguish and passion, are we not absurd to find the evidence of either in these sonnets, written, as they are, on a private sorrow, but in the spirit of conscious art? (Intro., p. cxi.) [The sound sense animating this note of Wyndham's makes it, in my judgment, worthy of special emphasis. Equally remarkable, in another way, is the grotesque literalness of the following note. — ED.] BUTLER: Between Sonnets 32 and 33 I suppose that there has been a catastrophe. [Some trap had been laid for Sh.; he was] made to "travel forth without" that "cloak," which, if he had not been lured, we may be sure that he would not have discarded. Hardly had he laid the cloak aside before he was surprised according to a preconcerted scheme, and very probably roughly handled, for we find him lame soon afterwards (37, 3). (p. 70.)

1. PORTER: A pause in time is indicated [here] by much the same means of indirect impression of an interval as is characteristic of Sh.'s manner of indicating the passage of time in the plays.

2. **Flatter.** LEE: Cf. *Edw. 3*, I, ii, 141: "Let not thy presence like the April sun flatter the earth."

STEEVENS: Cf. *K.J.*, III, i, 77–80:

> The glorious sun
> Stays in his course and plays the alchemist,
> Turning with splendour of his precious eye
> The meagre cloddy earth to glittering gold.

5–6. *CAPELL: Cf. *1 H. 4*, I, ii, 220–26:

> The sun,
> Who doth permit the base contagious clouds
> To smother up his beauty from the world,
> That when he please again to be himself
> Being wanted, he may be more wond'red at
> By breaking through the foul and ugly mists
> Of vapours that did seem to strangle him.

HENRY BROWN: [Cf. *3 H. 6*, V, iii, 3–6:

> In the midst of this bright-shining day
> I spy a black, suspicious, threat'ning cloud,
> That will encounter with our glorious sun. (p. 173.)]

6. **rack.** MALONE: The fleeting motion of the clouds. Cf. *A. & C.*, IV, xiv, 10: "Even with a thought the rack dislimns." DOWDEN: A mass of vapoury clouds. "The winds in the upper region, which move the clouds above (which we call the *rack*)," Bacon, *Sylva Sylvarum*, sec. 115, p. 32, ed. 1658 (quoted by Dyce, *Glossary*).

7. **for-lorne.** ABBOTT [notes this as one of the words accented "nearer the

beginning than with us." (§ 492.) ROLFE notes that its accent is penultimate only when it precedes an accented syllable.]

8. **to west.** ABBOTT: As much an adverb as "westward." (§ 90.)

11. **one houre mine.** TYLER: Pretty clear evidence that, when the incident in question occurred, the friendship had been very brief. (Intro., p. 17.)

12. TYLER: Cf. *T. G. V.*, I, iii, 84–87:

> O how this spring of love resembleth
> The uncertain glory of an April day,
> Which now shows all the beauty of the sun,
> And by and by a cloud takes all away.

region. *N. E. D.*; One of the successive portions into which the air or atmosphere is theoretically divided according to height. [Dowden quotes the Clarendon Press edition of *Hamlet* to the effect that] by Sh. the word is used to denote the air generally. [Cf. *Haml.*, II, ii, 607.]

13. **this.** PERCY SIMPSON [notes that the comma here is an instance of its use between parts of a sentence which are in inverted order. (*Sh. Punctuation*, pp. 49–51.)

14. **staine.** SCHMIDT: Grow dim. [For the transitive use, see 35, 3.]

PRICE [views this sonnet, with 73 and 97, as representing,] in their power of using the beauty of physical nature as the symbol of human emotion, . . . the highest lyrical expression that English poetry has achieved. (p. 375.)

COLERIDGE [instances the opening of this Sonnet (together with S. 107) as characteristic of Sh.'s imaginative style, by which he] gives a dignity and a passion to the objects which he presents. Unaided by any previous excitement, they burst upon us at once in life and in power. (*Biog. Lit.*, chap. 15.)

34

WHY didst thou promise such a beautious day,
And make me trauaile forth without my cloake,
To let bace cloudes ore-take me in my way,
Hiding thy brau'ry in their rotten smoke.
Tis not enough that through the cloude thou breake,
To dry the raine on my storme-beaten face,
For no man well of such a salue can speake,
That heales the wound, and cures not the disgrace:
Nor can thy shame giue phisicke to my griefe,
Though thou repent, yet I haue still the losse,
Th' offenders sorrow lends but weake reliefe
To him that beares the strong offenses losse.
Ah but those teares are pearle which thy loue sheeds,
And they are ritch, and ransome all ill deeds.

2. **trauaile**] *travel* G², E, etc.
4. **thy**] *my* C. **smoke.**] *smoke?* G², etc.
10–12. **losse . . . losse**] *cross . . . cross* S², E; *loss . . . cross* C, M, etc.
11. **Th' offenders**] *The offender's* M, Kt, B, Del, Cl, Gl, Kly, Cam, Do, R, etc.
12. **beares the**] *bears* G¹; *beareth* G², S, E.
13. **sheeds**] *sheds* G, etc.

MR. HORACE DAVIS [notes the resemblance of this and the following sonnet to S. 120; cf. especially the repeated words "salve," "wound," "sorrow," "ransom."]

4. **brav'ry.** SCHMIDT: Splendour. [Cf. 15, 8.]

7–8. **such . . . that.** ABBOTT: "Such" was, by derivation, the natural antecedent to "which"; . . . hence [it] is used with other relatival words. (§§ 278–79.) FRANZ: In Sh. "as" is the regular correlative, yet the relative pronouns appear with it, "that" most numerously. (§ 207.)

MASSEY: Cf. Spenser, *F. Q.*, Bk. 2, c. 1, st. 20:

> All wrongs have mends, but no amends of shame.
> Now, therefore, lady, rise out of your pain,
> And see the salving of your blotted name. (p. 127.)

8. **disgrace.** PORTER: Such disgrace as is meant by "right perfection wrongfully disgrac'd" (66, 7).

12. **losse.** MALONE. The word ["cross"] now substituted is used by our

author, in the sense required here, in 42, 12. Dowden: See also 133, 8 . . . and 134, 13 ["him have I lost"].

[De Wailly (*pseud.* A. Morlaix), conceiving this sonnet to be addressed by lover to lady, comments in a passage whose Gallicism may perhaps serve as a pleasing contrast to the Teutonic criticism with which the Sonnets have been more largely overlaid:] N'est-ce pas une scène charmante? ces reproches de l'amant blessé, le repentir de la jeune femme qui, croyons-le cette fois, n'a été qu'un peu coquette et légère; sa promesse, à deux genoux s'il le faut, de ne plus retomber dans la même faute; le jeune homme persistant tant qu'il peut dans son ressentiment et s'excitant à la fermeté, mais ne pouvant résister à la vue des larmes de celle qu'il aime, et la relevant pour la presser sur son cœur, n'est-ce pas là un délicieux chapitre de roman? et ne vous revient-il pas à la mémoire cet air ravissant de Zerlina, *Batti, batti, O bel Mazetto*, dans le *Don Juan* de Mozart? (*Rev. des d. Mondes*, 3 ser., 4: 685.)

35

No more bee greeu'd at that which thou hast done,
Roses haue thornes, and siluer fountaines mud,
Cloudes and eclipses staine both Moone and Sunne,
And loathsome canker liues in sweetest bud.
All men make faults, and euen I in this,
Authorizing thy trespas with compare,
My selfe corrupting saluing thy amisse,
Excusing their sins more then their sins are:
For to thy sensuall fault I bring in sence,
Thy aduerse party is thy Aduocate,
And gainst my selfe a lawfull plea commence,
Such ciuill war is in my loue and hate,
That I an accessary needs must be,
To that sweet theefe which sourely robs from me,

2. **siluer fountaines**] Hyphened by Kly.

7. **corrupting saluing**] *corrupting, salving* G², S², etc.; *corrupt in salving* C.

8. **their . . . are**] Quoted by Bull. **their . . . their**] *thy . . . thy* C, M, etc, (except Wy, Bull); *thy . . . their* Wy; *thee . . . thy* Be conj.; *their . . . thy* Bull. **are**] *bear* or *share* Sta conj.

9. **thy**] *my* G, S, E. **in sence**] *incense* G², S², E, M conj.

9–10. **sence, Thy . . . Aduocate**] *sense, (Thy . . . advocate,)* M, A, Kt, B, Hu¹; *sense (Thy . . . advocate)* Ty; *sense, — Thy . . . advocate, —* Del, Dy, Sta, Cl, Hu², Ox, Bull; *sense — Thy . . . advocate —* Gl, Wh, Cam, Do, R, Wy, But, Her, Be, N, Wa; *sense, — Thy . . . advocate —* Kly; *sense, Thy adverse party, as thy advocate,* Do conj.

13. **accessary**] *accessory* A, Kt, B, Hu¹, Sta, Kly, But.

14. **sourely**] *sorely* G, S, E.

---

3. FLEAY: The eclipse of the moon (Cynthia-Elizabeth) and the sun (Southampton; cf. 33, 14 and 34) are, I think, conclusive of a date when Sh. was temporarily out of favour with both court and patron, and no such date can I find but 1597, *circa* June. (*Biog. Chron.*, 2: 217.)

4. **canker.** WYNDHAM: Cf. 70, 7; 95, 2.

6. DOWDEN: [Finding] precedents for your misdeed by comparisons with roses, fountains, sun, and moon. TYLER: By comparing thy fault to the "loathsome canker" . . . I really give the fault a sanction ("authorizing it");

for it sinks into insignificance and disappears altogether when such extravagant comparison is made. [For other interpretations, see notes on l. 8.]

7. **My selfe corrupting.** TYLER: By unduly esteeming the offence against me, I foster an excessive sense of my own importance. [I cannot understand this note, taken with the context. The "corrupting" appears to be that infection of the speaker which his very love for the friend is causing. — ED.] **amisse.** SCHMIDT: Offence. [Cf. 151, 3. The *N. E. D.* explains the substantive as adjective or adverb used *quasi* "a doing amiss" or "a thing which is amiss."]

8. [Notes on this difficult line must be read in connection with the efforts made to amend the text. The change of "their" to "thy," in either or both instances, is of course amply warranted by analogous errors (see note on 26, 12). Bullen's ingenious reading, the equivalent of "Making this excuse: Their sins are more than thine," is attractive but unidiomatic. — ED.] STEEVENS [reading "thy . . . thy"]: Making the excuse more than proportioned to the offence. DELIUS [same reading:] My pardon of thy sins goes further than thy sins themselves. MASSEY [defends the Q text, but his interpretation is wrapped up with his "dramatic" theory which understands this sonnet to be spoken by a woman:] The plural ["their"] belongs to all men. . . . The speaker says, "All men commit faults, . . . and even I who am not a man do so in authorizing your trespass by comparison with *theirs*. . . . In doing this she is 'salving' his 'amiss' by excusing 'their sins more than their sins are.'" That is, she exaggerates the sins of men in general, and their proneness to faults, on purpose to make less of his. (p. 125.) WYNDHAM: I retain the second "their," and put a comma after the first "sins," believing that "than their sins are" refers back to "All men make faults." . . . The sense is: "All men make faults, and even I in saying so, giving authority by thy trespass by thus comparing it to the faults of all men; I myself am guilty of corrupting in so 'salving thy amiss'; excusing thy sins (which are) more than their sins are." BUTLER [reading "thy . . . thy":] Finding examples that will justify your act, becoming an accessory to it, glozing it over, and making excuses for it, are worse sins than any of which you are guilty. BEECHING [same reading]: The necessary sense is plain from the line which follows. The poet sins worse than his friend because in his excuse he sins against reason; and this can be got out of the reading . . . by taking "more" in the sense of worse; i.e., "excusing thy sins with more wickedness than they themselves denote." PORTER [Q text]: All men are faulty, and even he in this is so in the same way that they are when they commit or "make faults," i.e., by excusing their sins in a way that is more sinful than their sins themselves are. [It is doubtful whether the labors of later critics have bettered the suggestion of Steevens. — ED.]

9. **sensuall.** SPALDING: [Not necessarily referring to the gratification of the senses, but as used by Hooker:] "The greatest part of men are such as prefer their own private good before all things, even that good which is sensual before whatsoever is most divine." (*Gent. Mag.*, 242: 309.) **sence.** MALONE [apparently not noticing the reading in earlier editions, proposed "incense," and brought together various parallels for the accent of such a word on the final

syllable.] STEEVENS: I believe the old reading to be the true one. . . . "Towards thy exculpation, I bring in the aid of my soundest faculties, my keenest perception, my utmost strength of reason, my *sense*." I think I can venture to affirm that no English writer, either ancient or modern, serious or burlesque, ever accented the substantive "incense" on the last syllable. DOWDEN: Reason, judgment, discretion. TYLER: Probably sense of thy true worth and consideration of the circumstances. WYNDHAM: Understanding, discernment, appreciation. Cf. *C. of E.*, II, i, 22, where men by contrast to the brute creation are "Indued with intellectual sense and souls." . . . There is also a play on the opposite meaning of "sense," akin to that of "sensual." SCHMIDT: Reason.

10. DOWDEN: If we receive the present text, "thy adverse party" must mean Sh. [But with the proposed reading "as thy advocate" it is Sense,] against which he has offended. WYNDHAM: "Advocate," with a capital, and the sequence of the next line, in which the poet himself "commences a lawful plea," confirm the Q text and indicate "thy advocate" = the poet.

13. **accessary.** *N. E. D.*: The substantive is etymologically "accessary" and the adjective "accessory." BUTLER: [Sh. here admits that he has himself been accessory to Mr. W. H.'s intrigue with his mistress.] . . . I imagine Sh. to be referring to the fact that he had written sonnets for W. H. to give the lady as though they were his own. [See note on S. 135.] [The reader may be harmlessly entertained by comments of this character. It is surely unnecessary to show that the figure "accessary" sums up the contents of lines 5–12. — ED.]

BUTLER: Nothing can be more obviously out of place, as coming between 34 and 36, than a sonnet which accuses Mr. W. H. of having committed a "sensual fault" in respect of the catastrophe of 33 and 34. [Butler has just argued, from S. 94 and other considerations, that, whatever faults the friend may have had, sensuality was not one of them.] On taking out 35, 36 follows 34 naturally enough. (p. 72.)

[Note the unusual structure of this sonnet: the principal pause which precedes the conclusion occurring not, as usual, at the end of the 12th line, but of the 11th. — ED.]

36

LET me confesse that we two must be twaine,
Although our vndeuided loues are one:
So shall those blots that do with me remaine,
Without thy helpe, by me be borne alone.
In our two loues there is but one respect,
Though in our liues a seperable spight,
Which though it alter not loues sole effect,
Yet doth it steale sweet houres from loues delight,
I may not euer-more acknowledge thee,
Least my bewailed guilt should do thee shame,
Nor thou with publike kindnesse honour me,
Vnlesse thou take that honour from thy name:
But doe not so, I loue thee in such sort,
As thou being mine, mine is thy good report.

4. **borne**] *born* Bo.
9. **euer-more**] *ever more* Walker conj., Wy.

DOWDEN: According to the announcement made in 35, Sh. proceeds to make himself out the guilty party. BEECHING: The poet has made no such announcement. He has called himself an "accessory," more to blame than the principal because he defends his action. . . . But that is a long way from "making himself out the guilty party." The sonnets from 36 to 39 must refer to a different topic.

WALSH [groups the sonnet with 39 and 62, as on the theme of the identity of the lover with the beloved. Cf. also 22 (and notes above), 40–42, 88, 112, 133–134; and *The Phoenix and Turtle:*

So they loved, as love in twain
Had the essence but of one;
Two distincts, division none;
Number there in love was slain.
Hearts remote, yet not asunder;
Distance, and no space was seen. . . .

Either was the other's mine; (etc.)]

[Mr. HORACE DAVIS notes the kinship of the sonnet with S. 89.]

3. **those blots.** TYLER: We ought probably to understand this expression, as well as the "bewailed guilt" of line 10, not of moral turpitude, but of the

professional occupation and lower social standing of the poet. [See notes on lines 6 and 10.]

5. **respect.** SCHMIDT: Thought. DOWDEN: Regard. Cf. *Cor.*, III, iii, 112: "I do love my country's good with a respect more tender." [So ROLFE and BEECHING.] TYLER: "But one respect" = perfect similarity. [WYNDHAM inclines to view the word as having its first meaning of "regard" in the sense of "looking towards" one object; this he connects with Dowden's interpretation of line 10. I incline to what I suppose to be Tyler's view, viz., that the word has its colorless meaning, sometimes glossed as "relation, point of view." On the other hand, for the more generally accepted interpretation one might cite 26, 12. — ED.]

6. **seperable.** MALONE: For "separating." ABBOTT: Adjectives . . . in *-ful*, *-less*, *-ble*, and *-ive* have both an active and a passive meaning. (§ 3.) WALKER [discusses the same matter, citing Sidney, *Arcadia*, Bk. 2, "In the deceivable style of affection." (*Crit. Exam.*, 1: 185.)] SCHMIDT: "Separable spite" = "spiteful separation." [See note on 9, 14.] ACHESON: [In this line, and 11–12, Sh. bewails his social position, and we are enabled to understand his application for a grant of arms in 1596. See note on S. 26. (*Sh. & the R. P.*, p. 119.)] PORTER [opposes the view that the reference is to disparity of rank.] Their separation in "social standing" was nothing new. And it has been clearly enough said in S. 35 that it was the effect of the imperfection on their internal relationship that caused the poet, through becoming an "accessary," by his great love and indulgence, to see that they must be twain, however much they still love each other. It is the poet's superior moral standing, his profounder intelligence, and more generous heart that involve separation.

8. **it.** ABBOTT: The supplementary pronoun is generally confined to cases where the relative is separated from its verb by an intervening clause, and where on this account clearness requires [the repetition]. (§ 249.)

10. DOWDEN: Perhaps the passage means: "I may not claim you as a friend, lest my relation to the dark woman — now a matter of grief — should convict you of faithlessness in friendship." WYNDHAM: There is much of probability in this gloss. PORTER: This is the guilt bewailed in S. 35, complicity in the higher realm of moral sense with a lower realm of sensual faultiness.

13–14. TYLER: The poet dissuades Mr. W. H. from publicly recognising the acquaintance, so that his social consideration may not be thereby compromised. [These lines are repeated as the concluding couplet of S. 96. See notes there. — ED.]

[For its general tone, this sonnet should be compared with 109–111. — ED.]

[S. SMITH TRAVERS views this sonnet as proof that the series was addressed to an illegitimate son of Sh. Cf. also 39, 62, 72.]

37

As a decrepit father takes delight,
To see his actiue childe do deeds of youth,
So I, made lame by Fortunes dearest spight
Take all my comfort of thy worth and truth.
For whether beauty, birth, or wealth, or wit,
Or any of these all, or all, or more
Intitled in their parts, do crowned sit,
I make my loue ingrafted to this store:
So then I am not lame, poore, nor dispis'd,
Whilst that this shadow doth such substance giue,
That I in thy abundance am suffic'd,
And by a part of all thy glory liue:
Looke what is best, that best I wish in thee,
This wish I haue, then ten times happy me.

7. **Intitled**] *Entituled* Wy. **their**] *thy* C, M, etc. (except Wy, N, Bull), Tu.
9. **nor**] *not* Wh².
10. **this**] *thy* Caldecott conj. (MS.).
11. **am**] *an* 1640.
14. **me**] *be* E.

---

3. **lame.** MALONE: Mr. Capell, grounding himself on this line, and another in S. 89, "Speak of my lameness, and I straight will halt," conjectured that Sh. was literally lame: but the expression appears to have been only figurative. Cf. *Cor.*, IV, vii, 7: "Unless, by using means, I lame the foot of our design." [Capell's observation was made in connection with the legend that Sh. had played the part of Adam in *A. Y. L.*; "For which he might be fitted by an accidental lameness, which, as he himself tells us twice in his Sonnets, befell him in some part of life." See *New Variorum* ed. of *A. Y. L.*, where Furness calls this a "monstrous idea," which every now and then "is blazoned forth as new and original by some one who discovers the Sonnets — by reading them for the first time." (p. 129.) An anonymous writer in the *Westm. Rev.* (68: 126) supports Capell's view on the rather curious ground that in l. 9 "the lameness is evidently distinct from the poverty and abasement." F. V. HUGO calls the term figurative, and offers as (rather dubious) proof the line from the *Pass. Pilgrim*, "Youth is nimble, age is lame." A correspondent of *N. & Q.* (5th ser., 1: 80), signing himself "Jabez," gives an amusing outline of the rise of the myth of Sh.'s lameness, and adds: "It has been reserved for me to inform the

world that Sh. was *crook-backed*, for has he not written, in S. 90, the line, 'Join with the spite of fortune, make me bow'? By Fortune's spite, then, he was a hunch-back, and by Fortune's dearest spite he was a limper!"] DOWDEN: Sh. uses "to lame" in the sense of "disable." Here the "worth" and "truth" of his friend are set over against the lameness of Sh.; the lameness is then metaphorical; a disability to join in the joyous movement of life. . . . Mr. Swinburne, in his mocking "Report of the Proceedings, etc., of the Newest Sh. Society," introduces Mr. E. reading a paper on "The Lameness of Sh. — was it moral or physical?" Mr. E. assumes at once that the infirmity was physical. "Then arose the question — In which leg?" Perhaps it is best so to dismiss the subject — with a jest. TYLER: [For the metaphor, cf. *A. Y. L.*, I, iii, 6: "Come, lame me with reasons"; (communicated by W. A. Harrison).] WYNDHAM: Obviously metaphorical, arising out of the illustration drawn from a "decrepit father." . . . [The term also] follows an allusion in the preceding number to some disgrace which, whether deservedly or not, has overtaken the poet. BUTLER: I accept the lameness, poverty, and contempt as literally true for this period of Sh.'s life. It does not follow that he had been lame long, nor yet that he remained so. BEECHING: The lameness must be metaphorical to keep the proportion with "worth and truth." . . . A good parallel is quoted by Dowden from *Lear*, IV, vi, 225 (Q): "A most poor man made lame by Fortune's blows." **dearest.** MALONE: Most operative. Cf. *Haml.*, I, ii, 182: "Would I had met my dearest foe in heaven." SCHMIDT: Heartfelt. [The *N. E. D.* distinguishes this and similar uses of the word as from O. E. *deor* (the more common "dear" being from *deore*), strenuous, bold; hence hard, grievous. Cf. *R. 2*, I, iii, 151, "Thy dear exile." That the two meanings were viewed as distinct words in Sh.'s time is surely more than doubtful. For such uses as the present one, Furness always cites the definition of W. A. WRIGHT: "'Dear' is used of whatever touches us nearly, either in love or hate, joy or sorrow." — ED.]

4. **truth.** Cf. 14, 11 and 14, and note on 54, 2.

5. C. A. BROWN: [These lines expressly indicate that the young man addressed was possessed not only of beauty but of birth and fortune. (p. 40.)] ARCHER: The young man [possessed of the qualities mentioned] can scarcely be unknown to fame. The beauty and wit, indeed, are matters of opinion, and the poet's testimony must be taken for what it is worth; but he would scarcely attribute birth and wealth to a youth who possessed neither. (*Fort. Rev.*, n. s. 62: 816.) BUTLER: Sh. does not say, "You have beauty, birth, wealth, and wit." He says, "If you have any single one of these four, or if you even have them all, and others that I have not named — whatever you may have, I shall graft my love thereon." Granted that Sh. would not name beauty if his friend was remarkably plain; birth, if he was notoriously base-born; wealth, if he was necessitous; or wit, if he was next door to a fool; but if he was good-looking, of the same social status as Sh. himself, not living from hand to mouth, and not a fool (which by the way I think he probably was), Sh. would be well within his rights in writing [these lines]; nor can I find clearer proof that nothing in the Sonnets suggests that their addressee was in a higher social position than Sh.'s,

than the fact that these lines are the strongest which those who would have him to have been a great nobleman are able to bring forward. (Intro., p. 52.) BEECHING: As the friend's beauty is sufficiently certified by the rest of the sonnets, the presumption is that his birth and wealth and wit are equally matters of fact. The whole point of the sonnet is that the friend had advantages of *fortune* which were denied to the poet. . . . This sonnet puts it beyond doubt that Sh.'s friend was substantially above the poet in social position. (Intro., p. xxx.) [On this subject, see also notes on S. 124. — ED.]

7. **Intitled in their parts.** MALONE: "Entitled" means, I think, ennobled. STEEVENS: Cf. *Lucrece*, 57:

> But Beauty, in that white intituled,
> From Venus' doves doth challenge that fair field;

[which I suppose means,] "beauty takes its title from that fairness or white." DELIUS: Established in thy gifts (with the right of possession). PALGRAVE: Ennobled in thy genius. [All the foregoing accept the emendation "thy."] SCHMIDT: Having a just claim to the first place as their due [i.e., more excellencies]; blundering modern editors [read "thy"]. ROLFE: Finding their title or claim to the throne in thy qualities. Cf. *Lucrece*, 57. TYLER: The various endowments of the poet's friend are spoken of as though each were a monarch reigning in its own domain with just title. WYNDHAM: I retain "their," and suggest that "Intitled" — a contraction formed according to the poet's usage from "Intituled" — "parts," and "crowned" may all three be explained by reference to contemporary terms of heraldry. . . . Guillim (*A Display of Heraldrie*, 1610) has a table of the science. The skill of Armoury is divided into (i) *Accidents* and (ii) *Parts;* and, without pursuing all the sub-heads under Parts, I may sum them up, generally, by saying that Parts = the technical term for the places in a shield on which armorial devices are borne. . . . After dealing with the Wreath and Cap of Dignity, he goes on to "other sorts of *Crownes*." . . . I take it, therefore, that the passage = Be it beauty, birth or wealth or wit which is displayed — as, in an *achievement* beneath the *Crown*, *charges* are blazoned each in its *part* of the coat-armour — "I make my love ingrafted to this store," = your worth and truth. [Wyndham goes on to cite a further passage in which Guillim notes "four parts" of nobility: riches, blood, learning, virtue; which he thinks shows a remarkable coincidence with line 5 of the sonnet.] BEECHING: [The only one of the terms for which Wyndham's note furnishes an heraldic meaning is "parts."] "Intituled" occurs in a more or less heraldic passage in *Lucrece* 57, but not in any technically heraldic sense. . . . Similarly in *L. L. L.*, V, ii, 822,

> If this thou do deny, let our hands part
> Neither intitled in the other's heart,

it means "having a claim to." Here it may be used absolutely, "in thy parts" being construed with "crowned"; or perhaps "in thy parts" is constructed with both. "These excellences sit crowned in thy various parts to which they

have a claim." LEE: Probably "ennobled in thee"; deriving (titles of) honour from association with thy capacities.

10. **shadow . . . substance.** WYNDHAM: Sh. takes the two terms from the philosophy of his day and uses them for poetical effect, as modern essayists take terms from modern philosophy, e.g., "objective" and "subjective," and use them in criticism. Cf. *M. W. W.*, II, ii, 215, "Love like a shadow flies when substance love pursues"; *M.V.*, III, ii, 128, "The substance of my praise doth wrong this shadow"; *R. 2*, II, ii, 14, "Each substance of a grief hath twenty shadows." . . . "Shadow" and "reflexion" were used by Renaissance Platonists as alternative metaphors in expounding Plato's doctrine that Beauty which we see is the copy of an eternal pattern, — Giordano Bruno had discoursed in Paris *de Umbris Idearum;* or, rather, they use "shadow" where we should use "reflexion." Cf. Hoby, *The 4th Booke of the Courtyer*, 1561: "Let us clime up the stayers, which at the lowermost stepp have the shadowe of sensual beauty"; . . . and Spenser, *Hymn in Honour of Beauty:* . . .

> Do still preserve your first informed grace
> Whose shadow yet shines in your beauteous face.

. . . So does Sh. employ "shadow," even apart from any philosophical significance, to mean only the "projection of likeness," and not the obscuring of light. . . . He also uses the term, here and elsewhere in the Sonnets, with less, or with more, approximation to the metaphysic use from which it was borrowed. [Cf. 43, 5–7; 53, 1–4, 10; 67, 7–8; 98, 14. Cf. also Drayton's sonnet "To the Shadow" (S. 13, ed. 1619).] [This interesting note of Wyndham's, like others of his on platonistic elements in Sh.'s poems, is well worthy of study, yet tends to err on the side of mystical complexity. Whether Sh.'s use of "shadow" in the meaning opposed to "substance" was a derivation, direct or indirect, from the language of philosophy, we scarcely have, as yet, information to enable us to say with certainty; but even so, his use of it is noticeably lacking in the mystical note characteristic (for example) of Spenser, as in the passage quoted above. BEECHING's statement represents the simple fact:] Often in Sh. contrasted with "substance" to express the particular sort of unreality of which "substance" expresses the reality. WALSH: Cf. Lilly, *Campaspe*, IV, iv: "Yet shall it [thy picture] fill mine eye: besides the sweet thoughts, the sure hopes, thy protested faith, will cause me to embrace thy shadow continually in my arms, of the which by strong imagination I will make a substance."

DRAKE: [When Sh. wrote this sonnet, only] a small portion of the fame and property which he afterwards enjoyed could have fallen to his share. (2: 50.)

38

How can my Muse want subiect to inuent
While thou dost breath that poor'st into my verse,
Thine owne sweet argument, to excellent,
For euery vulgar paper to rehearse:
Oh giue thy selfe the thankes if ought in me,
Worthy perusal stand against thy sight,
For who's so dumbe that cannot write to thee,
When thou thy selfe dost giue inuention light?
Be thou the tenth Muse, ten times more in worth
Then those old nine which rimers inuocate,
And he that calls on thee, let him bring forth
Eternal numbers to out-liue long date.
If my slight Muse doe please these curious daies,
The paine be mine, but thine shal be the praise.

2. **poor'st**] *powr'st* 1640; *pour'st* G, etc.
3. **to**] *too* 1640, G, etc.
4. **rehearse:**] *rehearse?* G², S², etc.
7. **dumbe**] *dull* G, S, E.

TYLER: This sonnet may be regarded as bringing to a close 33–38.

LEE: The central conceit here so finely developed — that the patron may claim as his own handiwork the *protégé's* verse because he inspires it — belongs to the most conventional schemes of dedicatory adulation. When Daniel, in 1592, inscribed his volume of sonnets entitled *Delia* to the Countess of Pembroke, he played in the prefatory sonnet on the same note, and used in the concluding couplet almost the same words as Sh.:

> Great patroness of these my humble rhymes,
> Which thou from out thy greatness dost inspire, . . .
> O leave not still to grace thy work in me. . . .
> Whereof the travail I may challenge mine,
> But yet the glory, madam, must be thine.
>
> (*Life*, p. 129.)

3. **argument.** SCHMIDT: Theme. [Cf. 76, 10; 79, 5; 100, 8; 103, 3; 105, 9. — ED.]

8. **invention.** SCHMIDT: Imaginative faculty, poetic fiction.

9–10. A. HALL: [Cf. Drayton, *Idea*, S. 18:

Three Nines there are, to every one a Nine: . . .
Nine Muses do with learning still frequent; . . .
My worthy one to these nine worthies addeth! . . .
My Muse, my worthy, and my angel then
Makes every one of these three nines a ten.
(*N. & Q.*, 6th s., 10: 62.)]

11–12. TYLER: [This passage] must go far towards fixing the sense of "the onlie begetter" [in the Dedication]. (Intro., p. 14.)

13. TYLER: [One may infer] that Sh. intended the publication of the first series of sonnets. (Intro., p. 137.) BUTLER: It is plain that some, at any rate, even of these early sonnets were recited among Sh.'s friends, and much admired.

14. **pain.** [Tyler notes that W. A. HARRISON suggested that this may be connected with "bring forth," 1, 11, — the pain of parturition.]

[This is a key-sonnet for MASSEY's "dramatic" theory,] the friend being treated by Sh. as the veritable author of future and forthcoming sonnets that are to be presented to him, or "stand against his sight," when written in his own book. (p. 100.)

GOEDEKE [believes the sonnet to have been addressed to Queen Elizabeth. (*Deutsche Rundschau*, 10: 386.)]

OSCAR WILDE [instances this sonnet in support of his fancy that the person addressed was the boy-actor for whom Sh. wrote his leading female parts. (*Portrait of Mr. W. H.*, p. 26.)]

39

Oh how thy worth with manners may I singe,
When thou art all the better part of me?
What can mine owne praise to mine owne selfe bring;
And what is't but mine owne when I praise thee,
Euen for this, let vs deuided liue,
And our deare loue loose name of single one,
That by this seperation I may giue:
That due to thee which thou deseru'st alone:
Oh absence what a torment wouldst thou proue,
Were it not thy soure leisure gaue sweet leaue,
To entertaine the time with thoughts of loue,
Which time and thoughts so sweetly dost deceiue.
And that thou teachest how to make one twaine,
By praising him here who doth hence remaine.

3. **bring**;] *bring?* G, etc.
4. **thee**,] *thee?* L, etc.
6. **loose**] *lose* G, etc.
10. **Were it not**] *Were't not that* G, S, E.
12. **dost**] *doth* M, etc. (except Wy, Wa); *do* C, Bo conj.

Butler: [This sonnet] appears to refer to the separation that was deemed expedient in 36. (p. 72.)

2. **better part of me.** Lee: My soul. . . . The phrase is similarly used by Daniel (*Cleopatra*, 594) and by Ovid, *Metam.*, xv, *ad fin.*, in Golding's translation. [Cf. 74, 8, and notes.]

4. [For the theme of identity, see notes on 22, 5–7 and 36.] Henry Brown: Cf. R. Davies, to his brother John Davies:

> To praise thee, being what I am to thee,
> Were (in effect) to dispraise thee and me;
> For who doth praise himself deserves dispraise;
> Thou art myself, then thee I may not praise. (p. 175.)

8. **That due.** Cf. 31, 12.

12. Malone: Which, viz., "entertaining the time with thoughts of love," doth so agreeably beguile the tediousness of absence. . . . There is nothing to which "dost" can refer. The change being so small, I have placed "doth" in

the text. BOSWELL: "Does" would be nearer the original reading; but I rather think it should be "do," making of "thoughts" the nominative case. COLLIER: [Possibly "dost" is right.] WYNDHAM: I retain the Q text, for the construction in the 2d person singular, which begins with the apostrophe to absence in line 9, recurs, with absence again as the subject, in line 13. It is, therefore, I think, rightly maintained in line 12, where the ellipsis of a "thou" presents no difficulty, being immediately supplemented by "And that thou" of line 13. . . . "Which time and thoughts (of love) thou (absence) dost so sweetly deceive." "Deceive" here does not mean to "mislead," . . . but "to cause to fail in fulfilment or realization" (*Imp. Dict.*), to defraud, defeat, undo, make vain. [Cf. *T. & C.*, V, iii, 90: "Thou dost thyself and all our Troy deceive," where the meaning is "undo." Absence, then, while helping to pass time sweetly,] does defraud and make vain time. [This is ingenious but unconvincing, when one considers the difficulty of the omitted "thou," and the more serious objection that the whole purport of the passage is the compensations of absence. — ED.] [Miss PORTER of course favors the Q text, observing that "which"] is not relative, but demonstrative, referring to the time and thoughts that Absence doth so sweetly deceive.

13. DOWDEN: Absence teaches how to make of the absent beloved two persons, one absent in reality, the other present to imagination. BUTLER: Cf. *Phœnix & Turtle* [quoted under S. 36].

14. STEEVENS: Cf. *A. & C.*, I, iii, 102–04:

> Our separation so abides, and flies,
> That thou, residing here, goes yet with me,
> And I, hence fleeting, here remain with thee.

40

TAKE all my loues, my loue, yea take them all,
What hast thou then more then thou hadst before?
No loue, my loue, that thou maist true loue call,
All mine was thine, before thou hadst this more:
Then if for my loue, thou my loue receiuest,
I cannot blame thee, for my loue thou vsest,
But yet be blam'd, if thou this selfe deceauest
By wilfull taste of what thy selfe refusest.
I doe forgiue thy robb'rie gentle theefe
Although thou steale thee all my pouerty:
And yet loue knowes it is a greater griefe
To beare loues wrong, then hates knowne iniury.
Lasciuious grace, in whom all il wel showes,
Kill me with spights yet we must not be foes.

6–8. **vsest . . . refusest**] *usedst . . . refusedst* But.
7. **this selfe**] *thy self* G, S; *thyself* E, M, etc. (except Wy, Bull, Wa).
11. **yet**] *yet*, Kt, Dy, Sta, Cl, Gl, Cam, Hu², R, Wh², Ox, etc. **knowes**] *knows*, C, M, A, Kt, B, Del, Hu, Dy, Sta, Cl, Gl, Kly, Cam, R, Wh², Ty, Wy, But, Her, N, Bull, Wa.
14. **spights**] *spight* G¹, S¹; *spite* G², S², E.

[This and the two following sonnets should be read in connection with 133–134 and 144, which are commonly supposed to have reference to the same situation. Whether they are also closely related to 33–35 there is more uncertainty. BEECHING infers such a relation, after the irrelevant contents of the intervening sonnets, by the rather violent assumption that the offence of the friend "has been repeated during the poet's absence referred to in 39, 9." On the nature of the situation here represented, and especially the complaisant attitude of the poet, there have been very divergent comments. On the whole, Wyndham's note under S. 33 seems to me to take the most rational point of view. — ED.]

HALLAM [finds the apparent situation of the poet to be humiliating, especially from his failure to resent, though he "felt and bewailed" the seduction of his mistress. (*Lit. of Europe*, Pt. 3, ch. 5, § 49.)] [To GILDEMEISTER the group of sonnets seems to be fatal to the biographical interpretation:] Can one seriously believe that this took place and that — what is still more incredible — such an occurrence was related to the salons of London, in rhymed conceits, by the

deceived lover himself? (p. 163.) FURNIVALL [quotes with approval, with special reference to the matter of the forgiveness of the wrong, a passage communicated to him by one M. J.:] There are some men who love for the sake of what love yields, and of these was Lord Bacon; and there are some who love for "love's sake," and loving once, love always; and of these was Sh. These do not lightly give their love, but once given, their faith is incorporated with their being; and having become part of themselves, to part with that part would be to be dismembered. Therefore if change or sin corrupt the engrafted limb, the only effect is that the whole body is shaken with anguish. . . . The offending member may be nursed into health, or loved into life again; but forsaken! — never! (Intro., p. lxiv.) LEE: The definite element of intrigue that is developed here is not found anywhere else in the range of Elizabethan sonnet-literature. [Those familiar with Sir Sidney Lee's sonnet criticism will not fail to appreciate the courageous frankness of this admission. — ED.] The character of the innovation and its treatment seem only capable of explanation by regarding it as a reflection of Sh.'s personal experience. . . . If all the words be taken literally, there is disclosed an act of self-sacrifice that it is difficult to parallel or explain. But it remains very doubtful if the affair does not rightly belong to the annals of gallantry. The sonneteer's complacent condonation of the young man's offence chiefly suggests the deference that was essential to the maintenance by a dependent of peaceful relations with a self-willed and self-indulgent patron. (*Life*, p. 154.) [Later, however, in the notes to his edition of Sh., Lee treats the situation even here as at least partially conventional:] The rivalry here indicated in the poet's heart between friendship with a man and love for a woman is no uncommon theme of Renaissance poetry. Petrarch (S. 227) confesses to the double sentiment:

> Carità di signore, amor di donna
> Son le catene, ove con multi affanni
> Legato son, perch'io stesso mi strinsi.

Cf. Beza's *Poemata*, 1548, *Epigrammata*, 90: "De sua in Candidam et Audebertum benevolentia." Clement Marot in a poetic address "A celle qui souhaita Marot aussi amoureux d'elle qu'un sien Amy" (*Œuvres*, 1565, p. 437), describing his solicitation in love by a friend's mistress, diagnoses a like conflict of emotions.

J. M. S. [in the *Spectator* (Dec. 3, 1898, p. 830), cites as a parallel to the situation and attitude represented in these sonnets, a letter written by St. Evremond to his unfaithful mistress:] "Peut-être ne savez-vous pas, que si je n'ose me plaindre de vous, pour vous aimer trop, je n'oserais me plaindre de lui, pour ne l'aimer guère moins: et s'il faut de nécessité me mettre en colère, apprenez-moi contre qui je me dois fâcher davantage; ou contre lui, qui m'enlève une maîtresse, ou contre vous qui me volez un ami. . . . J'aime le perfide, j'aime l'infidèle, et crains seulement qu'un ami sincère ne soit mal avec tous les deux." WALSH: Whether this is a real or an imaginary episode cannot be determined from the sonnets themselves. A dramatic poet like Sh. was perfectly capable

of inventing the incident and writing about it as if actual. There is some similarity with the plot of *T. G. V.* (supposed to have been written in 1592–93), and also, in places, with the language of that play. BRADLEY: Hallam's explanation of [the poet's attitude] as perhaps due to the exalted position of the friend, would make it much more than unpleasant; and his language seems to show that he, like many critics, did not fully imagine the situation. . . . It is necessary to realise that, whatever the friend's rank might be, he and the poet were intimate friends; that, manifestly, it was rather the mistress who seduced the friend than the friend the mistress; and that she was apparently a woman not merely of no reputation, but of such a nature that she might readily be expected to be mistress to two men at one and the same time. Anyone who realises this may call the situation "humiliating" in one sense, and I cannot quarrel with him; but he will not call it "humiliating" in respect of Sh.'s relation to his friend; nor will he wonder much that the poet felt more pain than resentment at his friend's treatment of him. There is something infinitely stranger in a play of Sh.'s, [the forgiveness of Proteus by Valentine in *T. G. V.*] . . . The incident is to us so utterly preposterous that we find it hard to imagine how the audience stood it; but, even if we conjecture that Sh. adopted it from the story he was using, we can hardly suppose that it was so absurd to him as it is to us. And it is not the Sonnets alone which lead us to surmise that forgiveness was particularly attractive to him, and the forgiveness of a friend much easier than resentment. (*Lectures on Poetry*, pp. 334–35.)

5. DOWDEN: If for love of me thou receivest her whom I love. [So ROLFE and TYLER.] WYNDHAM: If in place of my love for you, you accept the woman I love. Cf. 42, 9. BEECHING: ["For my love" means] *as being* my love, to which you have a right. [I think Wyndham's explanation decidedly the most probable. — ED.]

6. usest. BUTLER, [in support of his emendation here and in line 8, observes:] A man cannot "wilfully" taste what at the same time he is refusing. If my text is admitted, the sense will be, "Do not blame me if you find this lady troublesome; you refused her for some time, and it is nobody's doing but your own that you now take up with her."

7. this selfe. WYNDHAM, [defending the Q text, explains:] The poet; must be interpreted in connexion with the identity of himself and the friend stated in 39, 1–4, and restated in 42, 13–14. [Cf. also 133, 6 and 135, 14.] . . . "This self" = the poet is distinguished from "thy self" = the friend of line 8; and this distinction of two persons who are one self is in harmony with the conceit which runs through the four numbers. PORTER: ["This self"] is the poet's and the beloved's very self, their unity, their joint "dear love" (39, 6).

8. DOWDEN: Deceive yourself by an unlawful union while you refuse loyal wedlock. WYNDHAM: Wilfully tasting "my love" = my mistress, while you, the other self, refuse "my love" = my love for you. TYLER, [apparently following Dowden's interpretation, thinks the passage may refer to the breaking off by William Herbert of his proposed marriage with Lady Vere. (Intro., p. 47.)]

BEECHING: Perhaps means "by taking in wilfulness my mistress whom yet you do not love." STOPES: The youth has refused the advice of the early sonnets, and now fears not "the mortal taste of that forbidden tree." LEE: "What thyself refusest" [is] that lascivious indulgence which thou in reality disdainest. [I can form no notion of what "in reality" means here. — ED.] PORTER: Wilful taste of such other kinds of love as the beloved himself refuses to their higher kind of love; i.e., shallow physical intercourse.

10. **poverty.** [The reading "property," in a German edition of 1864, is almost worthy to be set beside the emendation, "Sermons in books, stones in running brooks." — ED.]

13. Cf. S. 95, and 150, 5–8.

BUTLER [finds in this sonnet a hint, given to Mr. W. H. by Sh.,] that he may very possibly find the lady not all that he could wish.

VON MAUNTZ [believes that the sonnet was addressed by a woman to a man, the only interpretation which seems credible or natural. (*Jahrb.*, 28: 277.)]

41

THOSE pretty wrongs that liberty commits,
When I am some-time absent from thy heart,
Thy beautie, and thy yeares full well befits,
For still temptation followes where thou art.
Gentle thou art, and therefore to be wonne,
Beautious thou art, therefore to be assailed.
And when a woman woes, what womans sonne,
Will sourely leaue her till he haue preuailed.
Aye me, but yet thou mighst my seate forbeare,
And chide thy beauty, and thy straying youth,
Who lead thee in their ryot euen there
Where thou art forst to breake a two-fold truth:
Hers by thy beauty tempting her to thee,
Thine by thy beautie beeing false to me.

1. **pretty**] *petty* B, Hu[1], Dy[1], Del[3], But.
2. **some-time**] *sometimes* 1640, G, S, E, Ox.
3. **befits**] *befit* G[2], S[2], E.
6. **therefore**] *and therefore* G[1], S, E.
7. **woes**] *wooes* 1640, M; *woos* G, S, E, Bo, etc.
8. **he**] *she* Tyr conj., M, etc. (except Co[3], Wy). **haue**] *has* E; *gave* Del[1] [error]. **preuailed.**] *prevailed?* G, etc. (except M, A, Co, B, Hal).
9. **Aye**] *Ah* E, M, A, Kt, Co, B, Del, Hu, Sta, Cl, Kly, Hal, Ty. **mighst**] *mightst* 1640, G, etc. **my seate**] *my sweet* (between commas) M, Hu[1], But, Wa; *my state* Del conj.

---

3. **befits.** [For the singular form with plural subject, see ABBOTT, § 333:] In some cases the subject-noun may be considered as singular in thought; . . . in other cases the quasi-singular verb precedes the plural object [error for *subject* — ED.]; and again, in others the verb has for its nominative two singular nouns or an antecedent to a plural noun. [Such instances] indicate a general predilection for the inflection in -s which may well have arisen from the northern E. E. 3d person plural in -s.

5–6. STEEVENS: Cf. *1 H. 6*, V, iii, 78–9:

> She's beautiful and therefore to be woo'd;
> She is a woman, therefore to be won.

LEE: Cf. *T. And.*, II, ii, 82–83:

She is a woman, therefore may be woo'd;
She is a woman, therefore may be won;

and Greene's *Orpharion*, 1599 (Works, Grosart, 12: 31): "She is but a woman, and therefore to be won."

8. **he.** [See textual notes.] MALONE: The poet without doubt wrote "she." DOWDEN: [The Q reading] may be right. WYNDHAM: The Q reading is more subtile in sense and more musical in sound.

9. **Aye.** [The change to "Ah" is quite unwarranted. Cf. *V. & A.*, 187, 833; *Lucrece*, 1167; *L.C.*, 321. — ED.] **seate.** MALONE [defends his emendation by various passages where "sweet" or "my sweet" is used in direct address]. BOSWELL: Mr. Boaden is of opinion that the context shews the original word to be right. Iago, as he observes, uses the word "seat" with the same meaning: ["I do suspect the lusty Moor hath leap'd into my seat." (*Oth.*, II, i, 305.)] DOWDEN: Dr. Ingleby adds, as a parallel, *Lucrece*, 412–13:

Who, like a foul usurper, went about
From this fair throne to heave the owner out.

H. D. GRAY: The word "thy" occurs seven times in this sonnet, and is never misprinted "their." The theory that it was included in a MS. where this mistake was so frequently made as to be almost a prevailing one must be reëxamined. [See note on 26, 12. — ED.]

BEECHING: Sometimes the [Shakespearean] sonnet falls not into three parts but into two, the break coming, after the Italian manner, at the end of the 8th line. Examples are 41 and 44, in both of which, as is natural under the circumstances, the couplet becomes part of the sestet, though it is left as detached as possible. (Intro., p. liii.) [S. 39 is precisely similar in these respects, and 29 and 33 for the importance of the pause at the end of the second quatrain. — ED.]

42

THAT thou hast her it is not all my griefe,
And yet it may be said I lou'd her deerely,
That she hath thee is of my wayling cheefe,
A losse in loue that touches me more neerely.
Louing offendors thus I will excuse yee,
Thou doost loue her, because thou knowst I loue her,
And for my sake euen so doth she abuse me,
Suffring my friend for my sake to approoue her,
If I loose thee, my losse is my loues gaine,
And loosing her, my friend hath found that losse,
Both finde each other, and I loose both twaine,
And both for my sake lay on me this crosse,
But here's the ioy, my friend and I are one,
Sweete flattery, then she loues but me alone.

6. **knowst**] *knew'st* Bo, A, Kt, B.
9, 11. **loose**] *lose* G, etc.
10. **loosing**] *losing* G, etc.

---

7. **abuse.** SCHMIDT: Maltreat. [Cf. 134, 12. But there may be a suggestion here, too, of the common Elizabethan meaning "deceive." — ED.]

8. **approove.** SCHMIDT: Like. [Since the word, in Sh., practically always implies a moral or mental judgment, when used in the sense "like" or "be pleased with," I am disposed to think it is here used in the sense of "make trial of." — ED.]

9. **my loves.** MALONE: [My mistress's.]

9–10. WALSH: Cf. *T. G. V.*, II, vi, 20–21:

> If I keep them, I needs must lose myself.
> If I lose them, thus find I by their loss, etc.

But there the friend is not identified with the speaker, — far from it, as yet; for the latter continues, "I to myself am dearer than a friend." Later, however, he makes the renunciation.

10–12. **losse . . . crosse.** DOWDEN: The "loss" and "cross" of these lines are spoken of in S. 34.

13. See notes on 22, 5–7.

PRICE [comments on the effective use of monosyllabic verse in this and the two following sonnets. (p. 367.) He also observes that this sonnet is one of

those in which] the poetic quality lies solely or almost solely in the melody of verse, in the refined and accurate choice of words, and in the emotional interest of the psychological problem, [without figure or other imaginative decoration.] Without introducing a single image of natural beauty, [the sonnet] shows the dramatic poet dealing, in verses of lovely form and arrangement, with a dramatic situation of most curious dramatic interest. (p. 374.)

HARRIS: This sonnet, with its affected word-play and wire-drawn consolation, leaves one gaping: Sh.'s verbal affectations had got into his very blood. To my mind the whole sonnet is too extravagant to be sincere. . . . None of it rings true except the first couplet. (*The Man Sh.*, p. 238.) [Cf. Wyndham's note on S. 33. — ED.]

43

WHEN most I winke then doe mine eyes best see,
For all the day they view things vnrespected,
But when I sleepe, in dreames they looke on thee,
And darkely bright, are bright in darke directed.
Then thou whose shaddow shaddowes doth make bright,
How would thy shadowes forme, forme happy show,
To the cleere day with thy much cleerer light,
When to vn-seeing eyes thy shade shines so?
How would (I say) mine eyes be blessed made,
By looking on thee in the liuing day?
When in dead night their faire imperfect shade,
Through heauy sleepe on sightlesse eyes doth stay?
All dayes are nights to see till I see thee,
And nights bright daies when dreams do shew thee me.

11. **their**] *thy* C, M, etc. **faire imperfect**] Hyphened by Walker conj.
13. **to see**] *to me* M conj., Hu², But.
13–14. **I see thee . . . thee me**] *I thee see . . . me thee* Taylor conj.(MS.); *thee I see . . . me thee* Lettsom conj., Hu².

This is one of the sonnets omitted from the *Poems* of 1640 and the editions based thereon.

[For the theme, cf. notes on S. 27; cf. also S. 61. To the analogous passages cited heretofore, MASSEY (p. 77) adds, for this sonnet, Sidney's *A. & S.*, 38:]

> This night, while sleep begins with heavy wings
> To hatch mine eyes, and that unbitted thought
> Doth fall to stray, and my chief powers are brought

To leave the sceptre of all subject things:
The first that straight my fancy's error brings
Unto my mind, is Stella's image; wrought
By Love's own self; [etc.]

[See also the following sonnet, 39: "Come Sleep! O Sleep!" — ED.]

1. **winke.** SCHMIDT: Shut the eyes, or have them shut. [Cf. 56, 6.]

2. **unrespected.** MALONE: Unregarded. [Cf. 54, 10. — ED.]

4. **darkely bright.** DOWDEN: Illumined, although closed. TYLER: Bright, though not seeing. [Is it possible that the phrase may mean that the eyes are bright most of all in the dark, because of what they see in dreams? — ED.] **bright in darke directed.** DOWDEN: Are clearly directed in the darkness. TYLER: Become bright through the vision of the loved image, when . . . directed in the darkness. WYNDHAM: In the dark they heed that on which they are fixed. LEE: Guided in the dark by the brightness [of thy "shadow"]. [The late Professor A. G. NEWCOMER explained the phrase: "Directed toward that which is bright in the dark," *bright-in-dark* having the effect of an adverb. — ED.]

5. DOWDEN: Whose image makes bright the shades of night. TYLER: Cf. 27, 11–12.

11. **their.** [Miss PORTER stands alone in wishing to keep the Q reading here. According to her, the word] refers to "eyes" — the "shade" or shadow of the eyes' sight. **imperfect.** TYLER: As being a mere insubstantial image.

13. **to see.** MALONE: We should perhaps read "to me." The compositor might have caught the word "see" from the end of the line. STEEVENS: As "fair to see" . . . signifies "fair to sight," so "all days are nights to see" means "all days are gloomy to behold," i.e., look like nights. DOWDEN: "To see till I see thee" is probably right in this sonnet, which has a more than common fancy for doubling a word in the same line.

[For this matter of word repetition, cf. SARRAZIN's note on S. 4.]

13–14. VON MAUNTZ: Cf. Ovid, *Tristia*, III, iii, 18: "Nulla venit sine te nox mihi, nulla dies."

PRICE [finds in this sonnet the largest percentage of pure or native diction. (p. 366.) See also note on S. 73.]

BRANDL [believes that the sonnet was addressed to a woman; and not only so, but identifies her as the "dark lady" on the extraordinary ground that she is represented as being] so dark that a shadow beside her seems bright. (p. xi.)

44

If the dull substance of my flesh were thought,
Iniurious distance should not stop my way,
For then dispight of space I would be brought,
From limits farre remote, where thou doost stay,
No matter then although my foote did stand
Vpon the farthest earth remoou'd from thee,
For nimble thought can iumpe both sea and land,
As soone as thinke the place where he would be.
But ah, thought kills me that I am not thought
To leape large lengths of miles when thou art gone,
But that so much of earth and water wrought,
I must attend, times leasure with my mone.
Receiuing naughts by elements so sloe,
But heauie teares, badges of eithers woe.

4. **From**] *To* G, S, E.
6. **farthest**] *furthest* Hu[1], Ox.
8. **As soone as thinke**] *Soon as he thinks* Verity conj.
10. **when**] *where* Be conj.
13. **naughts**] *naught* G, etc.
14. **woe.**] *woe:* M, A, Kt, B, Del, Dy, Sta, Cl, Kly, Hu[2], Ty.

ISAAC [compares with this and the following sonnet Tasso's *Rime Amorose*, 16:]

Donna, crudel fortuna, a me ben vieta
Seguirvi, e'n queste sponde or mi ritiene,
Ma 'l pronto mio pensier non è chi frene,
Che sol riposa, quanto in voi s'acqueta. (*Jahrb.*, 17: 185.)

MASSEY: [This and 45 are spoken by the traveler of the journey introduced in 50, when he is at the remotest distance from the friend at home. He is on distant shores, with vast spaces of earth and water between him and home. This cannot be Sh. (pp. 91, 95.)]

4. MASSEY: From "limits far remote" where I am, . . . to where thou dost stay. (p. 140.)

6. [ABBOTT notes this among his transpositions of adjectival phrases, comparing "A happy gentleman in blood and lineaments" (*R. 2*, III, i, 9) and "You have won a happy victory to Rome" (*Cor.*, V, iii, 186). (§ 419 a.)]

7–8. LEE: Sonnets dealing in like manner with thought's triumph over space are very common in Renaissance poetry. Cf. Ronsard, *Amours*, I, 168: "Ce fol penser, pour s'envoler trop haut"; Du Bellay's *Olive*, 43: "Penser volage, et leger comme vent"; Amadis Jamyn, S. 21: "Penser, qui peux en un moment grande erre courir"; and Tasso's *Rime* (1583, Venice, i, 33): "Come s'human pensier di giunger tenta al luogo."

9. thought. DOWDEN: Perhaps "thought" here means melancholy contemplation, as in *J.C.*, II, i, 187, "Take thought and die for Cæsar." [The reference, of course, is to the first occurrence of the word in the line, the second occurrence referring back to line 1; and surely there is no need of Dowden's cautious "perhaps." — ED.]

9–10. MCCLUMPHA: Cf. *R. & J.*, II, v, 4–6:

> Love's heralds should be thoughts,
> Which ten times faster glide than the sun's beams, [etc.]

11. STEEVENS: Being so thoroughly compounded of these two ponderous elements. Cf. *A. & C.*, V, ii, 292–93:

> I am fire and air; my other elements
> I give to baser life.

MALONE: Cf. *H. 5*, III, vii, 22: "He is pure air and fire; and the dull elements of earth and water never appear in him." LEE: [Here and in S. 45] Sh. has adapted to his own purpose a leading principle of Ovid's natural philosophy:

> This endless world contains therein, I say,
> Four substances of which all things are gendered. Of these four
> The earth and water for their mass and weight are sunken lower.
> The other couple, air and fire, the purer of the twain,
> Mount up, and nought can keep them down. [Golding's version.]

Such a theory of the elements was common knowledge among the medieval and Renaissance poets; but Sh.'s mode of contrasting the density of earth and water with that of fire and air sounds a peculiarly Ovidian note. (*Qu. Rev.*, 210: 471.)

14. BEECHING: Perhaps the salt in the tears represents the contribution of the earth; and so tears are a badge of the woe of both earth and water.

45

THE other two, slight ayre, and purging fire,
Are both with thee, where euer I abide,
The first my thought, the other my desire,
These present absent with swift motion slide.
For when these quicker Elements are gone
In tender Embassie of loue to thee,
My life being made of foure, with two alone,
Sinkes downe to death, oppresst with melancholie.
Vntill liues composition be recured,
By those swift messengers return'd from thee,
Who euen but now come back againe assured,
Of their faire health, recounting it to me.
This told, I ioy, but then no longer glad,
I send them back againe and straight grow sad.

4. **present absent**] *present, absent*, G², S, E; hyphened by M, etc.
8. **opprest**] *press'd* C.
9. **liues**] *live's* G¹; *life's* G², etc.
12. **their**] *thy* C, M, etc.

DELÉCLUZE [(*Dante Alighieri*, p. 536) calls this sonnet the twin brother of Dante's 22nd in the *Vita Nuova:*]

Gentil pensiero, che parla di vui,
Sen viene a dimorar meco sovente,
E ragiona d'amor sì dolcemente,
Che face consentir lo core in lui.

4. VON MAUNTZ: Cf. Sidney, *A. & S.*, 60, 13: "Whose presence, absence; absence, presence is."

7. **foure.** STEEVENS: Cf. *T.N.*, II, iii, 10: "Does not our life consist of the four elements?"

8. **melancholie.** WALKER: Sh. was incapable of anything so discordant as this. . . . Ought "melancholy" to be pronounced *mel'anch'ly?* [This pronunciation is approved by ROLFE. There is no warrant for it in any other of the numerous occurrences of the word in Sh.; and while there seems no escape from something of the kind here, we may well suspect the finished character of the text. — ED.]

9. **recured.** SCHMIDT: Restored to health or soundness.

12. **their.** [Even Miss PORTER hesitates to keep the Q reading here, though she believes it may be right, referring to the poet's thought and desire.]

46

MINE eye and heart are at a mortall warre,
How to deuide the conquest of thy sight,
Mine eye, my heart their pictures sight would barre,
My heart, mine eye the freeedome of that right,
My heart doth plead that thou in him doost lye,
(A closet neuer pearst with christall eyes)
But the defendant doth that plea deny,
And sayes in him their faire appearance lyes.
To side this title is impannelled
A quest of thoughts, all tennants to the heart,
And by their verdict is determined
The cleere eyes moyitie, and the deare hearts part.
As thus, mine eyes due is their outward part,
And my hearts right, their inward loue of heart.

3, 8. **their**] *thy* C, M, etc.

9. **side**] *'cide* G², S², E, C, M, A, Kt, Co, B, Del, Hu, Sta, Cl, Gl, Kly, Wh, Cam, Do, R, Ty, Ox, But, Her, Be; *cide* Dy, Hal, Bull.

13–14. **their . . . their**] *thy . . . thy* C, M¹, Gl, Dy², Hu², R, Wh², Wy, Her, Be, N, Bull, Wa; *thine . . . thine* M², A, Kt, Co, B, Hu¹, Del, Dy¹, Sta, Cl, Kly, Wh¹, Hal, Cam, Do, Ty, Ox, But.

ISAAC [thinks that this sonnet follows S. 24 directly. In the latter] the eye of the poet had painted the portrait of the beloved on the table of his heart; in 46, in sequence to it, occurs a contest between the eye and the heart for the possession of the picture. [He also believes that this and 47 are love-sonnets, not sonnets of friendship. For the theme of an allegorical strife he cites parallels in Dante, Petrarch, etc., and compares Sidney, *A. & S.*, 52:

> A strife is grown between Virtue and Love,
> While each pretends that Stella must be his.

Cf. also Drayton, *Idea*, 33:

> Whilst yet mine eyes do surfeit with delight,
> My woful heart (imprisoned in my breast)
> Wisheth to be transformed to my sight,
> That it, like those, by looking might be blest.

(*Archiv*, 61: 414–16.)]

MASSEY: [This and the following sonnet] are obviously based on one of Drayton's [i.e., the one just cited]. (p. 141.) TYLER [notes the same resemblance

(Intro., p. 40), but believes Drayton to have been the imitator.] DOWDEN: Cf. Watson, *Tears of Fancy*, Sonnets 19–20 ["My heart impos'd this penance on mine eyes," and "My heart accus'd mine eyes and was offended"]; Constable, *Diana*, 6th Decade, S. 7 ["My heart mine eye accuseth of his death"]. CREIGHTON [believes the sonnets to be a parody of the pair in Watson's collection. (*Blackwood*, 169: 673.)] LEE: The war between the eye and the heart is a favorite topic among Renaissance sonneteers. [See further, Lee's note on S. 24.] LORD CAMPBELL: This sonnet is so intensely legal in its language and imagery, that without a considerable knowledge of English forensic procedure it cannot be fully understood. (*Sh.'s Legal Acquirements*, p. 102.) [That such knowledge was widely current in the Elizabethan age has been abundantly shown; see, for example, Robertson, *The Baconian Heresy*, 1913, chapters 3–6.]

9–10. LEE: The legal terminology of this sonnet is common in Spenser, Barnes, Barnfield, and many other writers of the day. Cf. *F. Q.*, bk. 6, vii, 34: "Therefore a jury was impaneled straight." [For "tenants" cf. Barnes, *P. & P.*, S. 20:]

> Those eyes (thy Beauty's tenants) pay due tears
> For occupation of mine heart, thy freehold.

9. **side.** MALONE: *'Cide*, for "to decide." WYNDHAM [keeping the Q spelling:] Adjudge this title to one or the other side. *N. E. D.*: Assign to one of two sides or parties. [Despite the authority of the *N. E. D.*, and the tendency of recent editors to revert to the Q text, I am very doubtful whether there is satisfactory warrant for doing so. The only known transitive use of the verb (in pertinent meanings) is with the apparent signification "to take sides with," *Cor.*, I, i, 197: "side factions." On the other hand, for the abbreviation *'cide* ABBOTT is able to cite numerous parallels, such as 'cital, 'cause, 'bout, 'gree, etc. (§ 460.) — ED.]

10. **quest.** MALONE: An inquest or jury. Cf. *R. 3*, I, iv, 189: "What lawful quest have given their verdict up?"

12. **moyitie.** MALONE: In ancient language signifies any portion of a thing.

13–14. **their . . . their.** PORTER: [The Q words may be kept, as referring to "thoughts." On the other hand, the correction to "thy" in lines 3 and 8 is for once admitted to be right.]

BEECHING [calls this sonnet and 47 early in style. (Intro., p. li.)]

WALSH: [The two sonnets, as well as the similar 24,] are generally supposed, without any good reason, to be addressed to the friend. The conceit . . . was common among the sonneteers of the time, coming down from Petrarch, and they always employed it in connection with their mistresses.

47

BETWIXT mine eye and heart a league is tooke,
And each doth good turnes now vnto the other,
When that mine eye is famisht for a looke,
Or heart in loue with sighes himselfe doth smother;
With my loues picture then my eye doth feast,
And to the painted banquet bids my heart:
An other time mine eye is my hearts guest,
And in his thoughts of loue doth share a part.
So either by thy picture or my loue,
Thy selfe away, are present still with me,
For thou nor farther then my thoughts canst moue,
And I am still with them, and they with thee.
Or if they sleepe, thy picture in my sight
Awakes my heart, to hearts and eyes delight.

1. **tooke**] *strook* C.
9. **thy picture or**] *the picture or* L; *the picture of* G, S, E.
10. **seife**] *selfe* 1640, etc. **are**] *art* C, M, etc. (except But).
11. **nor**] *not* 1640, etc.; *no* C. **farther**] *further* Hu, Ox.

---

1. **tooke.** Cf. *J.C.*, II, i, 50: "Where I have took them up" (ABBOTT, § 343); and *T.N.*, I, v, 282: "He might have took his answer" (FRANZ, § 12).

3. MALONE: Cf. *C. of E.*, II, i, 88: "Whilst I at home starve for a merry look." DOWDEN: Cf. 75, 10.

10–12. **still.** [The use of the word in these two lines well illustrates the connection between the modern meaning "still" and the meaning "always." — ED.]

LEE: [This sonnet] clearly suggested such a passage in Suckling's [*Tragedy of Brennoralt*] (V, 18–22; cf. *Fragmenta Aurea*, 1656, p. 44), as:

> Will you not send me neither
> Your picture when y' are gone?
> That when my eye is famisht for a looke,
> It may have where to feed,
> And to the painted feast invite my heart.
>
> (Sonnets, Facsimile ed., 1905, p. 52 n.)

48

How carefull was I when I tooke my way,
Each trifle vnder truest barres to thrust,
That to my vse it might vn-vsed stay
From hands of falsehood, in sure wards of trust?
But thou, to whom my iewels trifles are,
Most worthy comfort, now my greatest griefe,
Thou best of deerest, and mine onely care,
Art left the prey of euery vulgar theefe.
Thee haue I not lockt vp in any chest,
Saue where thou art not, though I feele thou art,
Within the gentle closure of my brest,
From whence at pleasure thou maist come and part,
And euen thence thou wilt be stolne I feare,
For truth prooues theeuish for a prize so deare.

[If Sh. could have foreseen the good fortune of this sonnet in escaping all textual vicissitudes, he might have regarded it as his masterpiece. — ED.]

[The resemblance, in theme, with S. 52, gives some warrant to WALSH in printing the two sonnets in succession.]

1–4. STOPES: A little touch of Sh.'s character; it shows he was careful and methodical, reticent withal. [Should one add an exclamation point? — ED.]

5. **to whom.** [For the use of "to" with the meaning "in comparison with" see ABBOTT, § 187, who treats it as closely related to the signification of *motion toward* ("when brought to the side of, and compared with"); SCHMIDT (2: 1236), who relates it to the use "denoting junction"; and FRANZ, § 376, who, in like manner, traces the meaning to the expression of relationship between two objects which are in a position to be viewed from the same standpoint and so compared. Cf. *Temp.*, I, ii, 481: "They to him are angels."]

10–11. See SIMPSON'S note on 22, 5–7.

11. BOSWELL: Cf. *V. & A.*, 782: "Into the quiet closure of my breast."

14. *CAPELL: Cf. *V. & A.*, 724: "Rich preys make true men thieves." HORACE DAVIS: Cf. 75, 6. DOWDEN: Does not this refer to the woman, who has sworn love (152, 2), and whose truth to Sh. (spoken of in 41, 13) now proves thievish? ROLFE: The meaning . . . may simply be that so rich a prize may tempt even true men to become thieves. [For **truth**, see note on 54, 2. — ED.]

MASSEY: [Such a sonnet as this] can only be spoken to a woman by a man. . . . In the plays, the only expressions equal to these in depth of tenderness are

such as those spoken by Posthumus to Imogen — "Thou the dearest of creatures." "Best of comfort," Cæsar calls his sister; "thou dearest Perdita" is Florizel's phrase; and the Duke of France, speaking of Cordelia to King Lear, says: "She that even but now was your best object, balm of your age, most best, most dearest." (p. 29.) SARRAZIN: This sonnet, which stands very near 127, 131, 132, fits the sense much better addressed to a sweetheart than to a friend. (*Sh.'s Lehrjahre*, p. 157.)

49

AGAINST that time (if euer that time come)
When I shall see thee frowne on my defects,
When as thy loue hath cast his vtmost summe,
Cauld to that audite by aduis'd respects,
Against that time when thou shalt strangely passe,
And scarcely greete me with that sunne thine eye,
When loue conuerted from the thing it was
Shall reasons finde of setled grauitie.
Against that time do I insconce me here
Within the knowledge of mine owne desart,
And this my hand, against my selfe vpreare,
To guard the lawfull reasons on thy part,
To leaue poore me, thou hast the strength of lawes,
Since why to loue, I can alledge no cause.

1. **come**] *comes* E.

3. **When as**] *Whenas* G², S², M, A, Kt, Co, B, Del, Hu, Dy, Sta, Cl, Kly, Wh¹, Hal, R, Ty, Cam², N, Bull.

10. **desart**] *desert* G, etc.

---

3. **cast . . . summe.** DOWDEN: Closed his account and cast up the sum total. [Cf. 2, 11: "sum my count." — ED.]

4. **advis'd respects.** DOWDEN: Well-considered reasons. Cf. *K.J.*, IV, ii, 214: "It frowns more upon humour than advised respect."

7–8. STEEVENS: Cf. *J.C.*, IV, ii, 20–21:

> When love begins to sicken and decay
> It useth an enforced ceremony.

8. **reasons . . . of setled gravitie.** SCHMIDT: [Reasons for] a dignified reserve. [So DELIUS; and BEECHING, who observes that this] is the constant use of "gravity" in Sh. [On the other hand, DOWDEN and ROLFE by implication, and TYLER, WYNDHAM, and PORTER explicitly, take the phrase to be the

equivalent of the "advis'd respects" of line 4 or the "lawful reasons" of line 12, — i.e., to mean "weighty reasons." Miss Porter remarks:] The dread of cold and formal argument is tolled out at the end of each quatrain, as "Against that time" is at the beginning. [This parallel certainly raises a presumption in favor of the second interpretation; and as to the usual meaning of "gravity" in Sh., it has reference to propriety of deportment rather than to a distant *hauteur*, and can scarcely be applicable here. One may also compare Hooker, *Eccl. Polity*, I, x, § 9: "To punish the injury committed according to the gravity of the fact." (Cited in *N. E. D.*) — Ed.]

10. **desart.** Delius: Little desert, or want of desert. [For the rhyme, cf. 11, 4 and 14, 12. — Ed.]

11–12. For the notion of the poet's becoming a witness against himself, cf. S. 88.

[This sonnet is one of those best representing the cumulative effect of the three-quatrain structure. Cf. also 52 and 73. — Ed.]

[Mackay believes that this sonnet introduces the sequence written to represent Leicester's love for Queen Elizabeth, the theme being developed in 57–58; 62–69; 104–107; 113–114; 118–122; 128; 140–142. (*Nineteenth Century*, 16: 256.)]

50

How heauie doe I iourney on the way,
When what I seeke (my wearie trauels end)
Doth teach that ease and that repose to say
Thus farre the miles are measurde from thy friend.
The beast that beares me, tired with my woe,
Plods duly on, to beare that waight in me,
As if by some instinct the wretch did know
His rider lou'd not speed being made from thee:
The bloody spurre cannot prouoke him on,
That some-times anger thrusts into his hide,
Which heauily he answers with a grone,
More sharpe to me then spurring to his side,
For that same grone doth put this in my mind,
My greefe lies onward and my ioy behind.

2. **what**] *that* G, S, E.

4. **Thus . . . friend**] Italics by M, Co^{3}, Hu^{2}; quoted by A, Kt, Co^{1,2}, B, Del, Hu^{1}, Dy, Sta, Cl, Gl, Kly, Wh, Hal, Cam, Do, R, etc.

6. **duly**] *dully* 1640, G, etc.

ISAAC [compares Petrarch's sonnet on a journey, Pt. i, S. 13:]

Io mi rivolgo indietro a ciascun passo
Col corpo stanco, ch' a gran pena porto;
E prendo allor del vostr' aere conforto,
Che 'l fa gir oltra, dicendo, Oimè lasso; [etc.]

MASSEY: [With this and the following sonnet cf. Sidney's sonnet on horseback, *A. & S.*, 49:

While I spur
My horse, he [i.e., Love] spurs with sharp desire my heart.

Also *R. 2*, I, iii, 268–70:

Every tedious stride I make
Will but remember me what a deal of world
I wander from the jewels that I love.

See also note on S. 44.]

PLUMPTRE: [Cf. Dante, *Vita Nuova*, S. 4:

Cavalcando l' altr' ier per un cammino,
Pensoso de l' andar che mi sgradia, etc.

(*Contemp. Rev.*, 55: 589.)]

5. **The beast.** FLEAY [is the only reader who has been able to give the name of this beast. In accordance with his metaphorical interpretation of the journey-sonnets (see note on S. 27), he observes that the horse] ridden by the poet is only the animal usually employed in carrying such burdens, — Pegasus. (*Macm. Mag.*, 31: 436.)

6. **duly.** MALONE: [For the emendation, cf. "dull" in 51, 2.]

51

THUS can my loue excuse the slow offence,
Of my dull bearer, when from thee I speed,
From where thou art, why shoulld I hast me thence,
Till I returne of posting is noe need.
O what excuse will my poore beast then find,
When swift extremity can seeme but slow,
Then should I spurre though mounted on the wind,
In winged speed no motion shall I know,
Then can no horse with my desire keepe pace,
Therefore desire (of perfects loue being made)
Shall naigh noe dull flesh in his fiery race,
But loue, for loue, thus shall excuse my iade,
Since from thee going, he went wilfull slow,
Towards thee ile run, and giue him leaue to goe.

3. **thou**] *tho* L. **thence,**] *thence?* G, etc.
6. **slow,**] *slow?* G, etc.
7. **wind,**] *wind?* Bo.
10. **perfects**] *perfect* G, S, E, M, A, Co, B, Hu[1], Cl, Kly, Wh[1], Hal, Ty; *perfect'st* Kt, Del, Dy, Sta, Gl, Cam, Do, Hu[2], R, Wh[2], Ox, etc.
11. **naigh . . . flesh**] *neigh to dull flesh* M conj.; *neigh (no dull flesh)* M, A, Kt, Co, B, Del, Hu[1], Cl, Wh[1]; *neigh — no dull flesh* — Dy, Gl, Hal, Cam, Hu[2], R, Wh[2], Ox, Her, Be, N; *neigh, — no dull flesh, —* Sta; *neigh, no dull flesh*, Kly, Ty; *neigh, no dull flesh* Do, Wy, Bull; *wait no dull flesh* Bulloch conj.; *need no dull flesh* G[2], Kinnear conj., But, Wa; *waigh no dull flesh* G. C. Smith conj.
13. **wilfull slow**] Hyphened by M[2], Co, B, Del, Hu, Dy, Sta, Cl, Gl, Wh, Hal, Cam, Do, R, Ox, Wy, etc.
13–14. **Since . . . goe**] Quoted by Do, Ox.

---

1. **slow offence.** BEECHING: Offence which consists in slowness.
4. **posting.** SCHMIDT: Going with speed. [Cf. *Lucrece*, 220: "In a desperate rage post hither." — ED.]
6. **swift extremity.** SCHMIDT: Extreme swiftness. [See note on 9, 14.] STEEVENS: Cf. *Macb.*, I, iv, 17: "That swiftest wing of recompense is slow."
7. **mounted on the wind.** MALONE: Cf. *2 H. 4*, Ind., 4: "Making the wind my post-horse." ROLFE: Cf. *A. Y. L.*, III, ii, 95: "Her worth being mounted on the wind."
10. **perfects.** [Despite the prevailing preference for the reading "perfect'st,"

I am disposed to prefer the "perfect" of the earlier editors, on grounds of euphony and because Sh. four times uses the expression "perfect love." — ED.]

11. See the textual notes for the weight of opinion respecting this difficult line. MALONE: The expression is here so uncouth that I strongly suspect this line to be corrupt. Perhaps we should read "to dull flesh": Desire, in the ardour of impatience, shall call to the sluggish animal (the horse) to proceed. STEEVENS: The sense may be this: "Therefore desire, being no dull piece of horse-flesh, but composed of the most perfect love, shall neigh as he proceeds in his hot career." "A good piece of horse-flesh" is a term still current in the stable. Such a profusion of words, and only to tell us that our author's passion was impetuous, though his horse was slow! DELIUS: Desire . . . shall serve the poet as steed and neigh in his fiery course, instead of the slow horse of flesh and blood. MASSEY: Horses are in the habit of neighing when they salute each other; they will do this, too, if speed be ever so important. And the writer says, his desire being made of perfectest love, having nothing animal about it, shall not *salute* any dull flesh in his fiery race. . . . Perhaps the poet was thinking of the words of the prophet Jeremiah: "They were as fed horses in the morning: every one neighed after his neighbour's wife." (p. 142.) [Despite Dowden's remark that "surely no comment is needful" on this interpretation, it appears to have been accepted by GOLLANCZ.] BULLOCH [defends his emendation, "wait" for "naigh":] the poet declares that he would dispense with all aid, which would be mere "dull flesh," and would excuse his poor steed, etc. (p. 281.) DOWDEN: Does it not mean: Desire, which is all love, shall neigh, there being no dull flesh to cumber him as he rushes forward in his fiery race? Cf. the neighing stallion of Adonis, *V. & A.*, 300–312. WYNDHAM [keeps the Q reading, save for a comma after "naigh":] shall neigh as a spirited horse neighs. A "race" of colts was a sporting term of the time (Madden) — akin to our "bevy" of quails, "wisp" of snipe, "herd" of deer. [BEECHING cites Wyndham as giving "race" the meaning "breed," (but this is certainly *not* the meaning of "bevy" or "herd." — ED.) He adds:] if "race" be explained as "breed," there is no word to imply that Desire gallops off home; he is left neighing. BUTLER [defends what he and the Cambridge editors call Kinnear's emendation of "need" for "neigh," though the textual notes will show that this had appeared in Gildon's second edition, with which the Cambridge editors were not acquainted. He paraphrases:] My desire to be with you will be so great that I shall need no such dull flesh as that of my "dull bearer" to convey me to you, but love will find an excuse for my poor beast which he would never have been able to discover for himself. LEE: Desire, which is all spirit and no dull flesh, shall neigh in the excitement of its impassioned flight. G. C. M. SMITH [defending his emendation "weigh" for "naigh":] Desire, which is identified with love, refuses to keep the slow pace of the horse. It will be no burden to his back. But as the horse . . . wilfully went slow on the outward journey, he shall not now be spurred to a speed beyond his powers. Love or desire will fly ahead, and leave the beast to walk. (*Mod. Lang. Rev.*, 9: 372.)

12. **for love.** TYLER: [This may mean "from love to the poor beast"; or "for the sake of the love awaiting me on my return"; or "on account of my affection"; or, as suggested by Mr. Bernard Shaw, "on account of the love shown by the horse" in the "plodding dully on" of 50, 6. Tyler inclines to the last interpretation, adding that "wilful," line 13, must then signify "purposely on account of affection."] **jade.** SCHMIDT: A term of contempt or pity for a worthless, or wicked, or maltreated horse. [The *N. E. D.* adds:] Sometimes used without depreciatory sense, playfully, or in generalized sense. [MASSEY, viewing the horse not as Sh.'s but as Southampton's, cites *R. 2*, V, v, 85, "That jade hath eat bread from my royal hand," as evidence that this may mean a horse such as a nobleman might ride. (p. 145.)]

13–14. DOWDEN: I have placed the last two lines, spoken, as I take it, by Love, within inverted commas.

14. **go.** ROLFE: The word here, as most of the critics agree, seems to have the specific sense of walking as opposed to running. Cf. *Temp.*, III, ii, 22: "We'll not run, Monsieur monster." "Nor go neither." . . . Schmidt defines "go" in [this passage] as = "walk leisurely, not to run"; but the instance in the text he puts under the head of *go* = "make haste." [Wherein he is certainly wrong. The word had no such specific meaning, except as any verb of motion may have it under certain circumstances. — ED.] Tyler makes "give him leave to go" = "dismiss him, or let him go at his pleasure."

52

So am I as the rich whose blessed key,
Can bring him to his sweet vp-locked treasure,
The which he will not eu'ry hower suruay,
For blunting the fine point of seldome pleasure.
Therefore are feasts so sollemne and so rare,
Since sildom comming in the long yeare set,
Like stones of worth they thinly placed are,
Or captaine Iewells in the carconet.
So is the time that keepes you as my chest,
Or as the ward-robe which the robe doth hide,
To make some speciall instant speciall blest,
By new vnfoulding his imprison'd pride.
Blessed are you whose worthinesse giues skope,
Being had to tryumph, being lackt to hope.

4. **fine**] *fair* E. **seldome pleasure**] Hyphened by Kly.
6. **sildom**] *seldome* 1640; *seldom* G, etc.
11. **speciall blest**] Hyphened by M, A, Kt, Co, Del, Hu, Dy, Sta, Cl, Kly, Wh[1], Hal.

With this sonnet cf. S. 48, and note.

4. MALONE: Cf. Horace: "Voluptates commendat rarior usus." **For blunting.** [On this use of "for," in the sense of "to prevent," see ABBOTT, § 154, who wrongly explains the meaning as originally "in opposition to"; FRANZ, § 327, who connects it with the final use, as in "to start for," with the additional notion of a circumstance which one seeks to avoid; and *N. E. D.* (vii, 23, d *sub nom.*), under the general signification of "the cause or reason."]

5–8. MALONE: Cf. *1 H. 4*, I, ii, 229–30:

> But when they [i.e., holidays] seldom come, they wish'd for come,
> And nothing pleaseth but rare accidents;

and *ibid.*, III, ii, 57–59:

> So my state,
> Seldom but sumptuous, show'd like a feast
> And won by rareness such solemnity.

VERITY: Cf. Montaigne, Essay on Inequality: "Feasts, banquets, revels . . . rejoice them that but seldom see them." (Stott's reprint, 2: 239.)

8. STOPES: Modern necklaces have their larger beads in the middle, but old

ones were threaded more like rosaries. **captaine.** SCHMIDT: Predominant. [The *N. E. D.* cites, under the adjective use with the meaning "principal," Stapleton's *A Return of Untruths* (1566): "A manifest and captain untruth."] **carconet.** *N. E. D.* (sp. *carcanet*): An ornamental collar or necklace, usually of gold or set with jewels.

9. WYNDHAM: Cf. 65, 10: "Time's chest."

10–12. STEEVENS: Cf. *1 H. 4*, III, ii, 56–57:

> My presence, like a robe pontifical,
> Ne'er seen but wonder'd at.

14. [For the varied scansion of "being" here, see ABBOTT, §§ 475–76:] A word repeated twice in a verse . . . may occupy the whole of a foot the first time, and only part of a foot the second. . . . When the word increases in emphasis, the converse takes place. [It is rather simpler to note that participles like "being," with the stem ending in a vowel, were (and are) treated as either monosyllabic or dissyllabic at will. — ED.]

For the structure of the sonnet, see note at the end of S. 49.

53

WHAT is your substance, whereof are you made,
That millions of strange shaddowes on you tend?
Since euery one, hath euery one, one shade,
And you but one, can euery shaddow lend:
Describe *Adonis* and the counterfet,
Is poorely immitated after you,
On *Hellens* cheeke all art of beautie set,
And you in *Grecian* tires are painted new:
Speake of the spring, and foyzon of the yeare,
The one doth shaddow of your beautie show,
The other as your bountie doth appeare,
And you in euery blessed shape we know.
In all externall grace you haue some part,
But you like none, none you for constant heart.

3. **one shade**] *one's shade* A, Kly.
7. **of**] *or* But.

On the theme of the sonnet, and the use of the term "shadow," see WYNDHAM'S notes on S. 31 and 37, 10.

ISAAC [compares some lines in a sonnet of Tasso's *Rime Amorose*, 15:]

Della vostra bellezza il mio pensiero
Vago, men bello stima ogni altro obietto:
E se di mille mai finge un aspetto,
Per agguagliarlo a voi, non giunge al vero.

(*Jahrb.*, 17: 186.)

2. **strange.** SCHMIDT: Belonging to another. Cf. *L.C.*, 303: "Subtle matter . . . all strange forms receives." **tend.** SCHMIDT: Wait (on). Cf. 57, 1.

4. DOWDEN: You, although but one person, can give off all manner of shadowy images.

5. **counterfet.** MALONE: Portrait. [Cf. 16, 8.] TYLER: The description. [WALKER remarks that the last syllable, commonly spelled *-feit*, was generally pronounced nearly as "fate."]

5–8. [In the first lines of this quatrain MASSEY finds an allusion to the writing of *V. & A.*, in which Adonis may stand in some sense for Southampton. (p. 38.) GERVINUS also takes the passage to involve allusions to descriptions in both *V. & A.* and *Lucrece:*] In *Lucrece* Sh. has mentioned Helen in the description of a picture, and it is as if the retrospect had suggested to him the allusion "You in Grecian tires are painted new." The image of the coy Adonis is closely connected with the substance of the first 17 sonnets [and, we may suppose, with the Southampton friendship]. (Trans., 1883, p. 447.) TYLER: Notice, from the comparison with Helen, the feminine character of Mr. W. H.'s youthful beauty. Cf. S. 20. [One is chiefly tempted, reading this quatrain, to conjecture what emphasis would have been placed on the allusion to Adonis or to Helen, if only Sh. had used either of them alone, as evidence of the sex of the person addressed! — ED.]

7. VERITY: Cf. *A. Y. L.*, III, ii, 153: "Helen's cheek, but not her heart."

8. **tires.** SCHMIDT: Head-dresses. DOWDEN: Head-dresses, or, generally, attire. ROLFE: The word may possibly be a contraction of "attires." TYLER: Head-dress properly, though here the word "tires" would seem to be used more generally. LEE: Attires, dress. [No one appears to have cited, in support of the more general interpretation of the word, the passage in *A. & C.*, II, v, 22 (Cleopatra speaking): "I . . . put my tires and mantles on him, whilst I wore his sword." On this R. H. CASE remarks (Arden or Dowden ed., p. 62) that the word is common in the meaning "attire," and cites Heywood, *The Brazen Age:* "Hence with these womanish tires"; also, for the singular, Rowlands's *The Knave of Hearts:* "Reach me my stockings, and my other tire." The *N. E. D.* cites Hooker, *Eccl. Polity*, V, 79, § 5: "Threescore and seven attires of priests." — ED.]

9. **foyzon.** MALONE: Plenty. SCHMIDT: Rich harvest. ROLFE: Here = autumn. [For the symbol of "your bounty" MALONE compares *A. & C.*, V, ii, 86: "For his bounty, there was no winter in 't; an autumn 't was," etc., where "autumn" is Theobald's reading for the Folio "Anthony."]

10. **show.** SCHMIDT [takes this to be intransitive, = "appear," as in 101, 14.]

11. **bountie.** BRANDES: [Cf. "wealth" in S. 37 and "dear-purchas'd right" in S. 117; evidence] that Pembroke must have conferred substantial gifts upon Sh. (*William Sh.*, 1: 349 n.)

14. MASSEY: [By those who read all these sonnets as addressed by Sh. to one friend,] the deceiver who has inflicted a public disgrace on the speaker of S. 34, who has been a base betrayer of all trust in S. 35, a thief and a robber in S. 40, the breaker of "two-fold truth" in S. 41, the same person, the thief, traitor, deceiver, betrayer, injurer, and living effigy of falsehood and inconstancy, is idiotically supposed to be told by Sh. in a neighboring sonnet that there is "None, none like you, for constant heart"! [Cf. also S. 105.] (p. 25.)

[OSCAR WILDE treats the "shadows" of this sonnet as the various playing parts taken by the youthful actor addressed (*The Portrait of Mr. W. H.*; see note on S. 38).]

54

Oh how much more doth beautie beautious seeme,
By that sweet ornament which truth doth giue,
The Rose lookes faire, but fairer we it deeme
For that sweet odor, which doth in it liue:
The Canker bloomes haue full as deepe a die,
As the perfumed tincture of the Roses,
Hang on such thornes, and play as wantonly,
When sommers breath their masked buds discloses:
But for their virtue only is their show,
They liue vnwoo'd, and vnrespected fade,
Die to themselues. Sweet Roses doe not so,
Of their sweet deathes, are sweetest odors made:
And so of you, beautious and louely youth,
When that shall vade, by verse distils your truth.

9. **is**] *in* 1640, G[1]. **virtue . . . is**] *vertue's only in* G, S, E.
10. **vnwoo'd**] *unmoov'd* 1640; *unmov'd* G, S, E.
14. **that shall**] *thou shalt* But conj. **vade**] *fade* G, S, E, M, A, Kt, Co, Hu[1], Sta, Gl, Kly, Wh, Hal, But, Her, Be, N. **by**] *my* C, M, Co[1,2], B, Hu, Gl, Kly, Wh, Hal, R, Ox, Wy, But, Her, Be, Bull, Wa.

---

2. **ornament.** PORTER: Not here used in the superficial sense, . . . but as the befitting token of the substance, that which shows what its essential nature is. **truth.** SCHMIDT: Fidelity. [Cf. 14, 11 and 14; 37, 4; 48, 14; 62, 6; 96, 8; 101, 2, 3, 6; 110, 5; 137, 12. (I omit 60, 11, where the meaning is doubtful.)

From a consideration of these passages, together with the present sonnet, it will appear that Sh. was exceedingly fond of coupling the notion of "truth" with that of "beauty"; that he used the term clearly in the meaning of "constancy," but sometimes with a more general connotation amounting apparently to "honor" or "virtue" (thus Schmidt gives the meaning "righteousness," citing among other passages *K.J.*, IV, iii, 144: "The life, the right and truth of all this realm is fled"); in other words, that he seems to have tended to adopt the word as signifying moral perfection set over against physical. — ED.]

5. **Canker bloomes.** MALONE: The canker-rose or dog-rose. [Cf. *M. Ado*, I, iii, 28: "I had rather be a canker in a hedge than a rose in his grace."] STEEVENS: Sh. had not yet begun to observe the productions of nature with accuracy, or his eyes would have convinced him that the *cynorhodon* is by no means of as deep a colour as the rose. But what has truth or nature to do with sonnets? ROLFE: Cf. *1 H. 4*, I, iii, 176:

> To put down Richard, that sweet lovely rose,
> And plant this thorn, this canker, Bolingbroke.

[The *N. E. D.* cites the passage just quoted, under the definition "An inferior kind of rose; the dog-rose (*rosa canina*)." From the accepted interpretation of the word there have been two dissenters. R. F. TOWNDROW, in *Ath.*, July 23 and Aug. 6, 1904, set forth his belief that the "canker," both here and in the passage in *1 H. 4*, is the crimson and green gall, or bedeguar, caused by the puncture of the *Rhodites rosae*, popularly known as "Robin's pincushion." Mr. Towndrow was sufficiently answered by G. BIRDWOOD, in the numbers for July 30 and Aug. 13. WYNDHAM, on the other hand, oddly takes the passage to be the familiar type of reference to a blossom eaten by canker (cf. 35, 4; 70, 7; 95, 2; 99, 13; and numerous passages in the plays). "So far as I know," says Mr. Wyndham, "'canker' is used by Sh. for the 'dog-rose' or wild briar only twice,"— viz., in the two passages quoted above. But if twice, one naturally asks, why not thrice? — ED.]

8. MALONE: Cf. *Haml.*, I, iii, 36–40:

> The chariest maid is prodigal enough,
> If she unmask her beauty to the moon.
> Virtue itself scapes not calumnious strokes.
> The canker galls the infants of the spring
> Too oft before the buttons be disclos'd.

BEECHING: It is curious to note that in this [*Hamlet*] passage the word "unmask" is found, and also "canker," though in a different sense. It is not impossible that the two passages may have been written about the same time, and that the one is something of an echo of the other. MCCLUMPHA: Cf. *R. & J.*, II, ii, 121:

> This bud of love, by summer's ripening breath,
> May prove a beauteous flower. (*Jahrb.*, 40: 196.)

discloses. SCHMIDT: Opens. BEECHING: The word would seem here to be suggested by the epithet; the wind's opening the rose being compared to a rough lover's pulling off a lady's visor.

9. **for.** [On the use of this as a conjunction (= "because"), see ABBOTT, § 151, and FRANZ, § 408.] **show.** SCHMIDT: Appearance.

9–11. WALSH: Cf. *V. & A.*, 131–32, 166:

> Fair flowers that are not gather'd in their prime
> Rot and consume themselves in little time. . . .
>
> Things growing to themselves are growth's abuse.

10. **unrespected.** See note on 43, 2.

11–12. See MALONE'S note on 5: 9–14.

13. BEECHING: "Lovely," being distinguished from "beauteous," shows that the word had not quite lost its meaning of "attractive."

14. **that.** DOWDEN: Beauty, the general subject of the sonnet; or youth, taken from "sweet and lovely youth" of line 13. **vade.** [A familiar variant of "fade." MAIN seems to think there is a distinction of meaning, citing Barnfield's *Complaint of Chastity*, st. 9:

> For what are pleasures but still-vading joyes?
> Fading as flowers.]

by. [The retention of this word by a few editors may possibly be justified on the ground that "distil" is found as an intransitive verb; it does not, however, seem to be found with the meaning of "is distilled," which is required here, but only with that of "trickle, issue forth in drops" (*N. E. D.*), as in *T. And.*, III, i, 17: "Rain that shall distil." — ED.] [DRAKE, though praising highly the sonnet as a whole, was pained by the "pharmaceutical allusion" in this last line. (*Sh. and his Times*, 2: 81.)]

WALSH: The idea expressed in this sonnet is peculiar, and matched only by the end of S. 5. Beauty is treated as external, secondary, and transient, while odor is taken to be inherent, primary, and preservable, — beauty a shadow, odor a substance; and to the latter is compared the youth's truth or constancy (see S. 20, 3–4, and 53, 14), to the former his beauty. But elsewhere the youth's beauty, or rather beauty embodied in the youth, is taken for the object of first importance, the substance that is to be preserved in one way or another. Even in S. 5 is no direct mention of odor (save only in the adjective "sweet"). But cf. Lilly: "Affection that is bred in enchantment, is like a flower that is wrought in silk, in colour and form most like, but nothing at all in substance or savour." (*Endimion*, I, ii.)

HENRY BROWN: This sonnet has been imitated by Henry Peacham in the *Minerva Britannia*, 1612, p. 100. (p. 177.)

For the appearance of lines 5–6 of the sonnet in a 17th century MS., see note at the end of S. 2.

55

Not marble, nor the guilded monument,
Of Princes shall out-liue this powrefull rime,
But you shall shine more bright in these contents
Then vnswept stone, besmeer'd with sluttish time.
When wastefull warre shall *Statues* ouer-turne, 5
And broiles roote out the worke of masonry,
Nor *Mars* his sword, nor warres quick fire shall burne:
The liuing record of your memory.
Gainst death, and all obliuious emnity 9
Shall you pace forth, your praise shall stil finde roome,
Euen in the eyes of all posterity
That weare this world out to the ending doome.
So til the iudgement that your selfe arise,
You liue in this, and dwell in louers eies.

1. monument] *monuments* M, etc. (except Ty).
4. vnswept] *in swept* Stengel conj.
5. Statues] *Statutes* G^1.
7. Mars his] *Mars's* G^2, S^2, E; *Marsis* M^1.
9. all obliuious] Hyphened by M, etc. (except Ty, Wa). emnity] *enmity* G^2, etc.
12. weare] *were* 1640.

C. A. Brown [makes this sonnet the envoy of his "second poem," 27–55.] Dowden: This looks like an envoy, but 56 is still a sonnet of absence.

Malone: Cf. Horace:

> Exegi monumentum aere perennius,
> Regalique situ pyramidum altius;

[and with the second quatrain] Ovid:

> Jamque opus exegi, quod nec Jovis ira nec ignes,
> Nec poterit ferrum, nec edax abolere vetustas.

Tyler: [Cf. with Meres, *Palladis Tamia*, 1598:] "As Ovid saith of his worke —

> Jamque opus exegi, quod nec Jovis ira, nec ignis
> Nec poterit ferrum, nec edax abolere vetustas;

and as Horace saith of his, —

> Exegi monumentum aere perennius,
> Regalique situ pyramidum altius,

Quod non imber edax, non Aquilo impotens
Possit diruere aut innumerabilis
Annorum series et fuga temporum;

so say I severally of Sir Philip Sidneys, Spencers, Daniels, Draytons, Shakespeares, and Warners workes —

Non Jovis ira, imbres, Mars, ferrum, flamma, senectus,
Hoc opus unda, lues, turbo, venena ruent.

Et quanquam ad pulcherrimum hoc opus euertendum tres illi Dii conspirabunt, Cronus, Vulcanus, et pater ipse gentis: —

Non tamen annorum series, non flamma, nec ensis,
Æternum potuit hoc abolere dieus." (Fol. 282.)

. . . Though evidence is wanting that Sh. possessed much, if any, acquaintance with Horace generally, yet we need have no difficulty in believing that, after Meres's book had been published, Sh.'s attention would be specially directed to the ode in question (iii, 30), or rather to that portion of it which Meres had quoted. . . . Very likely he received a presentation copy of *Wit's Treasury*. But whether this was the case or not, it is unlikely that he would long remain ignorant of the compliment which had been paid to him. And as evidence that he did in fact become acquainted with Meres's book, it is very noteworthy that there are some things in the 55th Sonnet which find their analogies, not in the passage from Horace, but in Meres's quotation from Ovid, and in particular in the Latin of Meres's appendix. It is Ovid, and not Horace, who speaks of the destructive agencies of fire and sword, "nec ignis, nec poterit ferrum." But the 7th line of the sonnet finds its closest analogy in Meres's "Non . . . Mars, ferrum, flamma" ("not . . . Mars, the sword, flame"). So close, indeed, is the resemblance, that it is scarcely possible to avoid the conclusion that Meres's Latin suggested the line in the sonnet. This conclusion is strengthened by the incongruity which manifests itself in the line, the verb "shall burn" suiting only "war's quick fire," and not the preceding "Mars his sword." It will be seen upon reflection that this incongruity is easily accounted for if the words "Mars," "sword," "fire," or the ideas they represent, were borrowed all together from Meres. The elements composing this line are not to be found in combination elsewhere in Sh., nor is the sword of Mars elsewhere mentioned. Then the expression of the 9th line, "all oblivious enmity," finds its explanation in the numerous influences tending to produce oblivion mentioned by Meres, though perhaps the word "enmity" has especially in view Meres's supposition of a hostile conspiracy on the part of the three deities. Lastly, what Sh. says of "overturning statues" and of "broils rooting out the work of masonry," may very well have been suggested by Meres's "ad pulcherrimum hoc opus evertendum," though this perhaps is not quite so conclusive. On the whole, however, that the 55th Sonnet was suggested by the passage from Meres seems scarcely open to question. It may be reasonably inferred, therefore, that S. 55 was written after the registration of Meres's book in September 1598.

(Intro., pp. 19–21.) [Mrs. STOPES supports Tyler's argument with the remark that] it is almost certain Sh. would see Meres's work in MS., [since] Meres was brother-in-law to Florio, another special protégé of the Earl of Southampton. [DOWDEN (Intro., p. 22) and ROLFE refer to this argument as ingenious; WYNDHAM considers it convincing (p. 249), and it is also accepted by WALSH. LEE calls the evidence very trivial, observing:] In Golding's translation [of Ovid] reference is made to Mars by name (the Latin here calls the god Gradivus) a few lines above [the translation of the "Jamque opus egi" passage,] and the word caught Sh.'s eye there. Sh. owed nothing to Meres's paraphrase, but Meres probably owed much to passages in Sh.'s sonnets. (*Life*, p. 117 n.) PORTER: Comparison of [Meres's Latin with the] quotations on which it is based and with the sonnet will show that the main idea of Meres's addition, i.e., all that is his own and has not already appeared in the citations from Horace and Ovid, is the notion of the three gods conspiring; also that the sonnet shows no convincing trace of this notion, nor the lesser details peculiar to Meres — i.e., the wave, pestilence, the whirlwind, poison. It is clear that Sh. did not use Meres's special contribution to the general idea and did use Horace and Ovid. (p. 136.) [Even if the resemblance between the sonnet and Meres's paragraph were so striking as to lead us to feel that some definite borrowing is involved, it would be peculiarly hazardous to follow Tyler's assumption that the borrower was Sh., since Meres happens to be the one contemporary of Sh.'s of whom we happen to have evidence that he had read Sh.'s sonnets in MS. — ED.]

W. M. ROSSETTI: That Sh., who led an inconspicuous life, and took no heed for the preservation of his writings later than the *V. & A.* and the *Lucrece*, should yet have known with such entire certainty that they would outlive the perishing body of men and things till the resurrection of the dead — this is the most moving fact in his extant history. [Yet Rossetti adds a foot-note in which he admits that similar expressions "formed almost a commonplace of sonnet-literature."] (*Famous Poets*, p. 47.) HALLIWELL-PHILLIPPS: [Some of the Sonnets] have the appearance of being mere imitations from the classics or the Italian. . . . It is difficult on any other hypothesis to reconcile the inflated egotism of such a one as 55 with the unassuming dedications to the *Venus* and *Lucrece*, 1593 and 1594, or with the expressions of humility found in the Sonnets themselves, e.g., 32 and 38. (*Outlines*, 8th ed., 2: 304.) VON MAUNTZ [observes that this difference can be explained by assuming that Sonnets 32 and 38 were addressed to Southampton in the beginning of the acquaintance, 55 later, when the poet felt more confidence in his genius.] BARRETT WENDELL: The writer of these sonnets . . . avows his belief that they shall be lasting literature. Not an infallible sign of serious artistic purpose, this is at least a frequent. It appears in Spenser's *Amoretti*, and in many passages of Chapman and of Ben Jonson, like that superb boast about poetry in the *Poetaster:*

> She can so mould Rome and her monuments
> Within the liquid marble of her lines,
> That they shall live, fresh and miraculous,
> Even in the midst of innovating dust.

In small men pathetically comic, such confidence becomes in great men nobly admirable. Of Sh.'s Sonnets, then, we may fairly assert that they must have seemed to the writer more important and valuable than his plays. (*William Sh.*, p. 223.) LEE: In the numerous sonnets in which Sh. boasted that his verse was so certain of immortality that it was capable of immortalizing the person to whom it was addressed, he gave voice to no conviction that was peculiar to his mental constitution, to no involuntary exultation of spirit, or spontaneous ebullition of feeling. He was merely proving that he could at will, and with superior effect, handle a theme that Ronsard and Desportes, emulating Pindar, Horace, Ovid, and other classical poets, had lately made a commonplace of the poetry of Europe. In Greek poetry the topic is treated in Pindar's *Olympic Odes*, xi, and in a fragment by Sappho, No. 16 in Bergk's *Poetae Lyrici Graeci*. In Latin poetry the topic is treated in Ennius as quoted in Cicero, *De Senectute*, c. 207; in Horace's Odes, III, 30; in Virgil's *Georgics*, III, 9; in Propertius, III, i; in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, XV, 871 seq.; and in Martial, X, 27 seq. Among French sonneteers Ronsard attacked the theme most boldly. His odes and sonnets promise immortality to the persons to whom they are addressed with an extravagant and a monotonous liberality. The following lines from Ronsard's Ode (livre i, No. 7), "Au Seigneur Carnavalet," illustrate his habitual treatment of the theme:

> C'est un travail de bon-heur
> Chanter les hommes louables,
> Et leur bastir un honneur
> Seul vainqueur des ans muables.
> Le marbre ou l'airain vestu
> D'un labeur vif par l'enclume
> N'animent tant la vertu
> Que les Muses par la plume. [etc.]
>
> (*Oeuvres*, ed. Blanchemain, 2: 58.)

. . . Desportes was also prone to indulge in the same conceit; cf. his *Cleonice*, S. 62, which Daniel appropriated bodily in his *Delia* (S. 26). Desportes warns his mistress that she will live in his verse like the phœnix in fire. Sir Philip Sidney, in his *Apologie for Poetrie* (1595), wrote that it was the common habit of poets "to tell you that they will make you immortal by their verses." "Men of great calling," Nash wrote in his *Pierce Pennilesse*, 1593, "take it of merit to have their names eternised by poets." In the hands of Elizabethan sonneteers the "eternising" faculty of their verse became a staple and indeed an inevitable topic. [Cf. Spenser, *Amoretti*, S. 75:

> My verse your virtues rare shall eternise,
> And in the heavens write your glorious name;

Drayton, *Idea*, 6, 14 ("my immortal song"), 44, 7 ("my world-out-wearing rhymes"), 44, 11 ("Ensuing ages yet my rhymes shall cherish"), 44, 14 ("My name shall mount unto eternity"); Daniel, *Delia*, 37, 9 ("This may remain thy lasting monument"), 39, 9 ("Thou mayst in after ages live esteemed"), 50, 9–12:

These are the arks, the trophies I erect
That fortify thy name against old age;
And these thy sacred virtues must protect
Against the dark and time's consuming rage.

. . . S. 55] is also very like Ronsard's Ode (livre v, No. 32) "à sa Muse," which opens:

Plus dur que fer j'ay fini mon ouvrage,
Que l'an, dispos à demener les pas,
Que l'eau, le vent ou le brulant orage,
L'injuriant, ne ru'ront point à bas. [etc.]

Cf. also Ronsard's S. 72 in *Amours* (livre i), where he declares that his mistress's name

Victorieux des peuples et des rois
S'en voleroit sus l'aile de ma ryme.

But Sh., like Ronsard, knew Horace's far-famed Ode, "Exegi monumentum aere perennius," [etc.] Nor can there be any doubt that Sh. wrote with a direct reference to the concluding ten lines of Ovid's *Met.* (xv, 871–79):

Jamque opus exegi, quod nec Jovis ira nec ignes,
Nec poterit ferrum, nec edax abolere vetustas.
Cum volet, illa dies, quae nisi corporis hujus
Jus habet, incerti spatium mihi finiat aevi;
Parte tamen meliore mei super alta perennis
Astra ferar nomenque erit indelebile nostrum.

This passage was familiar to Sh. in one of his favourite books — Golding's translation of the *Metamorphoses*. Golding's rendering opens:

Now have I brought a worke to end which neither Jove's fierce wrath
Nor sword nor fire nor fretting age, with all the force it hath,
Are able to abolish quite. . . . [And all the world shall never
Be able for to quench my name. . . . And time without all end . . .
My life shall everlastingly be lengthened still by fame.]

(*Life*, pp. 113–17; see also Lee's article in *Qu. Rev.*, 210: 462.)

[Von Mauntz notes other passages in Ovid bearing on this theme than that in the *Metamorphoses;* viz., *Tristia*, I, vi, 35–36:

Quantumcumque tamen praeconia nostra valebunt,
Carminibus vives tempus in omne meis;

ibid., III, iii, 77–78:

Etenim maiora libelli
Et diuturna magis sunt monimenta mihi;

ibid., III, vii, 50–52:

Me tamen extincto fama superstes erit,
Dumque suis septem victrix de montibus orbem
Prospiciet domitum Martia Roma, legar;

Amores, I, x, 61–62:

> Scindentur vestes, gemmae frangentur et aurum:
> Carmina quam tribuent, fama perennis erit.

To which he might have added the lines in *Ex Ponto*, IV, viii, *passim;* cf. especially 45–48:

> Carmina vestrarum peragunt praeconia laudum,
> Neve sit actorum fama caduca, cavent:
> Carmina fit viva virtus, expersque sepulcri
> Notitiam serae posteritatis habet.]

WALSH: [Besides the parallels noted by Lee], the last sonnet of Bellay's *Ruins of Rome*, in Spenser's translation, may also be noted. [This, like the Horace and Ovid passages], is addressed to the poet himself, or his work. It is possible that Sh. was here apostrophising himself, and intended this for his closing sonnet. Accordingly, Mr. Godwin puts it last in his re-arrangement. But the "you" here appears more appropriately the "thou" than the "I" of [S. 107.] It is amusing that in all this effort to eternise somebody, the name of the person concerned is never so much as mentioned even in a heading. Other sonneteers of the period, who published their own sonnets, often "eternised" their friends under fictitious names! All this was a poetical convention, and the principal object striven after was to see which could do the eternising best, with little regard to the person addressed or his or her deserts.

E. S. BATES: In answer [to Lee's remarks on the triteness of the eternizing theme] it should be pointed out that it is rather curious that this theme was emphasized most by the three poets of the century who actually had the greatest right to expect immortality for their verses. Pierre de Ronsard, Edmund Spenser, and William Sh. were the ones who expressed the thought most frequently and most nobly. Why is it impossible that these men should have sincerely believed in the permanence of poetry, or that this thought should have given them deep emotion? And if in regard to the passing of beauty we do not doubt the sincerity of Keats when he reiterates the same strain, why shall we not be permitted to believe in that of Sh.? These ideas are so universal, so moving, so intrinsically poetical, that to account for their presence, even in the special form of promising eternity to a particular person, we hardly need to assume a hollow endeavor at flattery as their cause. A sufficient explanation would seem to be that among the current poetical conceptions of the time these were particularly congenial to Sh.'s world-brooding mind. (*Mod. Philology*, 8: 101–02.)

4. **unswept.** MALONE [interprets "dusty," by implication, comparing *A. W. W.*, II, iii, 147: "Where dust and damn'd oblivion is the tomb of honour'd bones."] PORTER: Gathering dust to grow lichens and moss in, helping the besmearing of the careless years.

6. **Mars his.** [The following of Malone's first edition may be traced in a

number of texts of the late 18th or early 19th century, through the remarkable genitive *Marsis* which appeared there. — ED.]

9. **all oblivious.** [For the hyphenating of these words, cf. "all-building," *M. for M.*, II, iv, 94; "all-changing," *K.J.*, II, i, 582; "all-ending," *R. 3*, III, i, 78; etc. SCHMIDT renders the phrase "forgetful of all," but ROLFE is doubtless right in saying "causing to be forgotten." Cf. *Macb.*, V, iii, 43: "Some sweet oblivious antidote." — ED.]

10. PORTER: This wonderful line owes something of its effect not alone to the music of the alliterative "pace forth" and "praise shall," but to the pacing forth of the single-syllabled words one after the other, till the verse is in itself a continuous steady-going procession. **pace forth.** TYLER: Come forth in public view. ROLFE: Still go on, endure.

12. **weare this world out.** BEECHING: To "wear out" is a common Shakespearean expression for "spend," used of time; often as here with a notion of "wearing away."

13. **judgement that.** DOWDEN: Till the decree of the judgment-day that you arise from the dead. [So ROLFE and WYNDHAM. BEECHING, with whom LEE agrees, makes "that" = "when"; and this is supported by ABBOTT's statement:] Since "that" represents different cases of the relative, it may mean "in that," "for that," "because" ("quod"), or "at which time" ("quum"). (§ 284.) PORTER: "Judgement," in one of its facets, means the Judgement Day, but in the other, and primary facet, here, of the sentence, the *judgement* of Doomsday: So here, till the judgment is pronounced that you yourself arise. [HUDSON has an extraordinary note, which it is perhaps cruel to perpetuate, to the effect that "arise" means "raises," "put in the plural for the rhyme."]

MARK PATTISON [mentions this Sonnet as an example of the bad effect of a violation of the rule forbidding the repetition of rime sounds in the different parts of the sonnet:] Let S. 55 be read aloud, and it will be felt how much the numbers lose by this fault; *enmity* and *posterity* being tercet rimes, following upon *masonry* and *memory* in the quatrains. (*Sonnets of Milton*, Introduction, p. 10.)

56

SWEET loue renew thy force, be it not said
Thy edge should blunter be then apetite,
Which but too daie by feeding is alaied,
To morrow sharpned in his former might.
So loue be thou, although too daie thou fill
Thy hungrie eies, euen till they winck with fulnesse,
Too morrow see againe, and doe not kill
The spirit of Loue, with a perpetual dulnesse:
Let this sad *Intrim* like the Ocean be
Which parts the shore, where two contracted new,
Come daily to the banckes, that when they see:
Returne of loue, more blest may be the view.
As cal it Winter, which being ful of care,
Makes Sõmers welcome, thrice more wish'd, more rare.

3, 5. **too daie**] *to-day* C, M, etc.
7. **Too morrow**] *To-morrow* C, M, etc.
9. **Intrim**] *interim* L, M, etc. (except Ty, Wy, Bull); *Int'rim* Ty, Wy, Bull.
10. **contracted new**] Hyphened by A, Kt, B, Del, Hu, Sta, Kly, Ty.
13. **As**] *Or* C, Tyr conj., M, A, Kt, Co, B, Del, Hu, Dy, Sta, Cl, Kly, Wh¹, Hal, Cam, Do, Ty, Ox, Wy, But, Be, N, Bull; *Else* anon. conj., Gl, R, Wh², Her, Wa; *Ah* anon. conj.

This sonnet was not in the *Poems* of 1640 or the editions based thereon.

WYNDHAM [makes the sonnet the first of his Group D, 56–74:] These 19 numbers, conceived in a vein of melancholy contemplation, are among the most beautiful of all, and are more subtly metaphysical than any, save only 123–25. (Intro., p. cxii.) BEECHING: I agree with Wyndham in taking this sonnet as opening a new section. . . . The "interim" of line 9 is a period of apathy, not of separation, the poet does not here say on whose part, but makes the poem quite general.

6. **winck.** See note on 43, 1.

8. **dulnesse.** SCHMIDT: Insensibility, indolence. DOWDEN: Drowsiness. [So ROLFE.]

9–12. DOWDEN: Is the sight of his friend . . . only the imaginative seeing of love; such fancied sight as two betrothed persons may have although severed by the ocean? TYLER: I would suggest whether the poet did not imagine an

irruption of the sea on land, so as to "part" what was previously continuous. But, through persistence of the wind or other cause, the sea holds for a time its conquest, and the two "contracted" or betrothed lovers come daily to the "banks," expecting that the sea has retired. But in line 12, instead of speaking of the return of the sea, the poet dismisses his simile, and speaks of the "return of love." WYNDHAM: The image is obscure. Perhaps it contains an allusion to the story of *Hero and Leander*. BEECHING: [The ocean is] any ocean that separates lovers. There does not seem to be a reference to any particular story. PORTER: The risk of death, surmounted by Leander in swimming across each day, . . . and the fate of death at last overtaking him, suits the idea here extremely well. . . . [But further], this "ocean" and this "shore" suggests the larger metaphor of the sea of Death and the elysian shore of the life beyond Death. [The late Professor A. G. NEWCOMER suggested an interpretation of the passage which I here set down, though he expressed himself as having no great confidence in it: "'Parts' does not seem to mean 'separates,' which would lead us to expect 'shores,' not 'shore.' Perhaps it means 'leaves, recedes from,' as in *R. 2*, III, i, 3: 'Your souls must part your bodies.' Then love is likened to an ocean with its tides, and we may paraphrase: 'Let this sad interim be only like waters that recede from their shore, where, viz., by this ocean of love (dropping the image of a real ocean at this point), two, contracted new, come daily to the banks, that when they see the tide of love come in again, more blest may be the sight.' Certainly this carries out the thought of the early part of the sonnet far better than the image of a sundering flood, which, at best, is difficult to work out satisfactorily. But I admit that we are under no obligation to seek unity of thought in the sonnets." I cannot say that I find the continuity of thought in the sonnet obscure, though it is true that the image in this quatrain is, for Sh., remarkable in its lack of distinctness. To me it suggests a pair of lovers who live on the opposite sides of a bay or estuary, where the ocean may be said to "part the shore," and who come daily to their respective banks for a view of each other which is the "more blest" for the situation which makes it difficult to obtain. And this interpretation may perhaps be supported by a passage brought to my attention by MR. HORACE DAVIS, in *3 H. 6*, I, ii, 135–38:

> Like one that stands upon a promontory
> And spies a far-off shore where he would tread,
> Wishing his foot were equal with his eye,
> And chides the sea that sunders him from thence.

For the thought of the quatrain, cf. S. 52; it is presented in the final couplet in an unmistakable image. The change from the first two quatrains to the third, then, is only in the imagery: the poet first says that interrupted love ought to be as capable of *renewing* itself as appetite, which must be newly satisfied every day; then, that interruption should even have the capacity of intensifying love, which is more blest on its *return* than if there had been no "interim." — ED.]

10. **contracted new.** TYLER: The words are important as according with the position that, when this sonnet was written, Sh.'s friendship with Mr. W. H. was still new.

11. **banckes.** BEECHING: Cf. *M.V.*, V, i, 11:

> Stood Dido with a willow in her hand
> Upon the wild sea-banks, and waft her love
> To come again to Carthage.

13. **care.** SCHMIDT: Sorrow.

ISAAC [views this as a love sonnet.] It is sufficient . . . to call to mind the tone, which points directly toward S. 75. . . . One may demand of those who think otherwise some proof that Sh.'s friendship was coupled with that violent tenderness which both sonnets exhibit and which can have justified the comparison of the friends with two newly betrothed. (*Archiv*, 62: 12–13.)

57

BEING your slaue what should I doe but tend,
Vpon the houres, and times of your desire?
I haue no precious time at al to spend;
Nor seruices to doe til you require.
Nor dare I chide the world without end houre,
Whilst I (my soueraine) watch the clock for you,
Nor thinke the bitternesse of absence sowre,
When you haue bid your seruant once adieue.
Nor dare I question with my iealious thought,
Where you may be, or your affaires suppose,
But like a sad slaue stay and thinke of nought
Saue where you are, how happy you make those.
So true a foole is loue, that in your Will,
(Though you doe any thing) he thinkes no ill.

5. **world . . . houre**] *world-without-end-hour* G^1, S^1; *world-without-end hour* G^2, S^2, etc.

ISAAC, [again viewing this and S. 58 as addressed to a lady, compares them with Rosaline's speech in *L. L. L.*, V, ii, 60–68:

> That same Biron I'll torture ere I go.
> O that I knew he were but in by the week!
> How I would make him fawn and beg and seek,

And wait the season and observe the times,
And spend his prodigal wits in bootless rhymes,
And shape his service wholly to my hests,
And make him proud to make me proud that jests!
So pedant-like would I o'ersway his state
That he should be my fool and I his fate.

(*Archiv*, 61: 425.)

KRAUSS notes the same resemblance, and thinks that both passages have reference to the tyranny of Lady Penelope Rich, one in connection with Sidney, the other with William Herbert. (*Jahrb.*, 16: 184.)]

VON MAUNTZ [compares Ovid, *Amores*, III, xiv, 41–42:]

Nil equidem inquiram: nec, quae celare parabis,
Insequar, et falli muneris instar erit.

DOWDEN: The absence spoken of in this sonnet seems to be voluntary absence on the part of Sh.'s friend.

5. **world without end.** MALONE: Cf. *L. L. L.*, V, ii, 799: "To make a world-without-end bargain in." J. D. BUTLER [(*N. & Q.*, 9th s., 11: 448) notes that the phrase is found in the King James Bible in *Isa.* 45: 17 and *Eph.* 3: 21, but that for Sh. it existed only in the Rheims Bible of 1582. Miss PORTER, however, properly refers it to the *Gloria* of the *Book of Common Prayer*.] LEE views the phrase as imitative of the compound epithets of the period, called by Ronsard "vocables composez" and by Sidney "compositions of two or three words together." (*French Renaissance in England*, p. 248.)

6. **soveraine.** [For those concerned to discuss the sex of the person addressed, it may be proper to call attention to the fact that Sh. frequently uses this word of women. — ED.]

8. **servant.** KNIGHT [considers this to be decisive for the view that Sonnets 56–58 were addressed to a woman.] The lady was the mistress, the lover the servant, in the gallantry of Sh.'s time. [But this use, of course, did not put an end to the other uses of the word. — ED.]

10. **suppose.** SCHMIDT: Figure to one's self, imagine. [The only use of the word in Sh. with a direct object. — ED.]

13. **true a foole.** STOPES: A suggestion of unwisdom in the passion. It may be intended to bear a double meaning. **Will.** MASSEY [treats this sonnet as belonging to the group of those containing puns on the poet's name. (p. 90.)] DOWDEN: If a play on words is intended, it must be "Love in your Will (i.e., your Will Sh.) can think no evil of you, do what you please"; and also "Love can discover no evil in your will." LEE: [Capitalization] was the usual practice at the time in the case of this and like words in poetry, e.g., Nature, Truth, Wit, Zeal, Soul. A doubtful endeavor has been made to detect in the word here a tame pun. [Tyler, Wyndham, Butler, Bullen, and Walsh are the modern editors who retain the capital in their text. — ED.]

TYLER [notes what he considers to be significant resemblances between passages in this and the following sonnet and a letter of Pembroke's to Cecil, dated June 19, 1601: "I cannot forbeare telling of you that yet I endure a grieuous Imprisonment, & so (though not in the world's misjudging opinion) yet in myself, I feel still the same or a wors punishment, for doe you account him a freeman that is restrained from coming where he most desires to be, & debar'd from enjoying that comfort in respect of which all other earthly joys seeme miseries, though he have a whole world els to walk in? In this vile case am I, whose miserable fortune it is, to be banish'd from the sight of her, in whose fauor the ballance consisted of my misery or happines, and whose Incomparable beauty was the onely sonne of my little world, that alone had power to give it life and heate. Now judge you whether this be a bondage or no: for mine owne part, I protest I think my fortune as slauish as any mans that lives fettered in a galley. You haue sayd you loued me, & I have often found it; but a greater testimony you can neuer show of it then to vse your best means to ridd me out of this hell." Tyler's conclusion is:] As the letter was written from London, the possibility may suggest itself that, if it was written by the hand of Pembroke, it was really composed by Sh. But it is perhaps more likely that Pembroke borrowed ideas from the sonnets which he had received from Sh. (Intro., pp. 59–61.)

[It is a point of some interest to inquire what is the intended tone of this and the following sonnet. BUTLER (p. 63) says, "Sh. is evidently very angry," and understands the manner to be one of bitter irony. He also views the pair as conclusive for the relatively low rank of the person addressed:] Is it conceivable that in S. 58 Sh. should tell a powerful nobleman that he could not even think of controlling his liberty or requiring him to give an account of his time?

58

THAT God forbid, that made me first your slaue,
I should in thought controule your times of pleasure,
Or at your hand th' account of houres to craue,
Being your vassail bound to staie your leisure.
Oh let me suffer (being at your beck)
Th' imprison'd absence of your libertie,
And patience tame, to sufferance bide each check,
Without accusing you of iniury.
Be where you list, your charter is so strong,
That you your selfe may priuiledge your time
To what you will, to you it doth belong,
Your selfe to pardon of selfe-doing crime.
I am to waite, though waiting so be hell,
Not blame your pleasure be it ill or well.

3. **th' account**] *the account* L, M, A, Kt, B, Del, Cl, Gl, Kly, Cam, Do, R, Wh², Ox, But, Her, Be, N.

6. **Th' imprison'd**] *The imprison'd* C, M, A, Kt, B, Del, Cl, Gl, Kly, Cam, Do, R, Wh², Ox, But, etc.

7. **patience tame, to sufferance**] *patience, tame to sufferance*, G², S², etc.; *patience tame to sufferance;* C.

10–11. **time To**] *time: Do* M, A, Kt, Co¹, ², B, Del¹, ², Hu, Sta, Kly, Hal, Wa; *time; Do* But, Be.

WALSH: A mere replica of the preceding [sonnet], and was probably intended to supersede it.

3. **to crave.** [Regarding the expletive "to," see ABBOTT:] Just as "that" is sometimes omitted and then inserted to connect a distant clause with a first part of a sentence, so sometimes "to" is inserted apparently for the same reason. (§ 416.)

6. DELIUS: Let me bear the fact that the liberty which you give, or possess, is wanting to me, a captive. DOWDEN: The separation from you, which is proper to your state of freedom, but which to me is imprisonment. Or, [the interpretation of Delius may be right.] WYNDHAM: The absence which, arising out of your liberty, is as imprisonment to me. BUTLER: Let me suffer the imprisonment of being kept at home waiting for you while you take your liberty and absent yourself (after having promised to come to see me). BEECH-

ING: Your absence, which, though it represent liberty to you, means imprisonment to me. [So, substantially, LEE.]

7. **tame, to sufferance.** MALONE: Cf. *Lear*, IV, vi, 225: "Made tame to fortune's blows." DOWDEN: Bearing tamely even cruel distress. TYLER: Subdue patience into suffering. [From which he would seem to take "tame" as a verb, though he puts the usual comma after "patience."— ED.] VERITY: ["Sufferance" may mean "the verge of great forbearance"; cf. *M.V.*, I, iii, 111: "Sufferance is the badge of all our tribe."] LEE: Complaisant in suffering. BEECHING: Subdued so as to suffer. Cf. *K.J.*, IV, ii, 262: "Tame to their obedience." [Miss PORTER alone sees a possibility of keeping the Q punctuation, explaining:] The poet suffers tame patience and bides to the point of suffering each rebuff. **bide each check.** ROLFE: Endure each rebuke or rebuff.

10. **priviledge.** SCHMIDT: Authorize, license. [Cf. *Lucrece*, 621: "To privilege dishonour in thy name."]

11. **To.** MALONE: There can, I think, be no doubt that [this is] a misprint. [See the textual notes for the extent to which his emendation has been accepted.] BEECHING: The rhythm and sense of the quatrain are against [the Q reading]. "Do what you will" answers rhetorically to "Be where you list;" else there is no verb of doing leading up to "self-doing crime," as "be" to "privilege your time."

13. **to waite.** KELLNER [notes this as a kind of "absolute infinitive," comparing *A. Y. L.*, III, ii, 162: "I to live and die her slave." (*Hist. Gram.*, § 400.)]

59

If their bee nothing new, but that which is,
Hath beene before, how are our braines beguild,
Which laboring for inuention beare amisse
The second burthen of a former child?
Oh that record could with a back-ward looke,
Euen of fiue hundreth courses of the Sunne,
Show me your image in some antique booke,
Since minde at first in carrecter was done.
That I might see what the old world could say,
To this composed wonder of your frame,
Whether we are mended, or where better they,
Or whether reuolution be the same.
Oh sure I am the wits of former daies,
To subiects worse haue giuen admiring praise.

1. **their**] *there* 1640, etc.
4. **burthen**] *burden* G², S², E, Co, Del, Dy, Sta, Cl, Hal, Hu², Ox, N, Bull, Wa.
6. **hundreth**] *hundred* G, etc.; *thousand* Stengel conj.
8. **minde**] *mine* 1640, G, S, E.
11. **Whether**] *Whe'r* Ox. **we are**] *we're* G², S², E, Hu. **where**] *whe'r* C, M, A, Kt, B, Del, Cl, Wh¹, Do, Ty, Ox, Wy, Be, Bull; *whêr* Hu, Dy, Sta; *whether* Gl, Cam, Co³, R, Wh², But, Her; *were* Kly; *whe'er* N, Wa.

ROLFE: Here, as Tyler notes, there is "pretty clearly a break of continuity."

[TYLER finds in this sonnet references to the "doctrine of the cycles," and compares a passage in *2 H. 4*, III, i, 80–86:

> There is a history in all men's lives,
> Figuring the nature of the times deceas'd;
> The which observ'd, a man may prophesy,
> With a near aim, of the main chance of things
> As yet not come to life, who in their seeds
> And weak beginnings lie intreasured.
> Such things become the hatch and brood of time.]

. . . It will be seen that [in the sonnet] the idea is not simply that the lives of men "figure the nature of the times deceased," but the absence of anything really new is supposed, so that even the brain itself, "labouring for invention," can but produce again what it has formerly brought forth. What follows as to

"five hundred courses of the sun" would seem to point to pre-existence in this, rather than in some former world. And here it is worthy to be observed that when Sh. was thus contemplating the course of things, the idea of an ocean of being seems to have presented itself to his mind; and such an idea is in accordance with what is said in [*2 H. 4*, III, i, 50] about the ocean and its "beachy girdle." [Cf. S. 60; "Like as the waves make towards the pebbled shore," etc.] . . . [As to the source of this doctrine, for Sh.] some points of correspondence in the writings of Bruno and Campanella might possibly be detected. But the doctrine, as it appears in the 59th and 123rd Sonnets, was the doctrine of the ancient Stoics, which was reproduced by the author of the biblical book of *Ecclesiastes*. . . . The verses in the first chapter of *Ecclesiastes* which contain the doctrine of the cycles are so salient and prominent, and lend themselves so easily to quotation, that I cannot readily allow the improbability of Sh.'s having obtained his knowledge from this source. Sh. does not speak of the doctrine as derived from his own reflection, but rather as an hypothesis received from without or heard from others. (Intro., pp. 104–08.) Mrs. STOPES, [following Tyler here and elsewhere in supposing some interest on Sh.'s part in the writings of Giordano Bruno, thinks that the present sonnet is a reference to some late discussion of those writings between Sh. and the friend addressed.] BEECHING: This sonnet anticipates the thought of Sonnets 106 and 123. LEE: Sh.'s treatment of the central tenet of Ovid's cyclical creed may be best deduced from Sonnets 59 and 123. In both these poems the doctrine of Nature's rotatory process is the main topic. . . . . In the first sonnet the poet seriously examines the theory without committing himself to it; in the second he pronounces in its favour, albeit with a smack of irony. [Golding's version of Ovid's statement is:]

> Things ebb and flow. . . . Even so the times by kind
> Do fly and follow both at once, and evermore renew. . . .
> Things pass perchance from place to place, yet all, from whence they came
> Returning, do unperished continue still the same.
>
> (*Qu. Rev.*, 210: 469.)

F. V. HUGO: N'est-il pas étrange de voir revenir ici cette doctrine de la metempsycose partie de l'ancienne Egypte et de la vieille Gaule? Remarquons aussi la conclusion dans laquelle Sh., repoussant l'idée indienne de l'immobilité et l'idée biblique de la décadence, proclame, avec la certitude du génie, le grand principe revolutionnaire du progrès indéfini.

3. **invention.** Cf. 38, 8 and note.

5. **record.** SCHMIDT: Memory. ROLFE: Accented by Sh. on either syllable, as suits the measure. Cf. 122, 8.

7–8. MALONE: Would that I could read a description of you in the earliest manuscript that appeared after the first use of letters. STEEVENS: This may allude to the ancient custom of inserting real portraits among the ornaments of illuminated manuscripts, with inscriptions under them. SCHMIDT, [under "character," paraphrases line 8:] Since thought was first expressed in writing.

10. **composed wonder.** ROLFE: Wonderful composition. [See Schmidt's note on 9, 14.]

11. **where.** MALONE: Whether. DOWDEN: Often monosyllabic in Elizabethan verse. [Cf. *V. & A.*, 304: "Where he run or fly" (Q spelling).] [From this only COLLIER dissents, saying that the clear meaning is,] In what respects were they better?

12. DOWDEN: Whether the ages, revolving on themselves, return to the same things. [Cf. *2 H. 4*, III, i, 46: "And see the revolution of the times." — ED.]

13–14. LEE: [Cf. Spenser's sonnet to Lord Charles Howard, in which he tells his patron] that "his good personage and noble deeds" made him the pattern to the present age of the old heroes of whom "the antique poets" were "wont so much to sing." (*Life*, p. 140.)

60

LIKE as the waues make towards the pibled shore,
So do our minuites hasten to their end,
Each changing place with that which goes before,
In sequent toile all forwards do contend.
Natiuity once in the maine of light. 5
Crawles to maturity, wherewith being crown'd,
Crooked eclipses gainst his glory fight,
And time that gaue, doth now his gift confound.
Time doth transfixe the florish set on youth, 9
And delues the paralels in beauties brow,
Feedes on the rarities of natures truth,
And nothing stands but for his sieth to mow.
And yet to times in hope, my verse shall stand
Praising thy worth, dispight his cruell hand.

1. **pibled**] *pebbled* E, etc.

13. **times in hope, my**] *times, in hope, my* G², S², E; *times in hope my* C, Co, Del, etc. (except Ty); *Time's wanhope my* Fleay conj.; *Time's own hour my* Bulloch conj.; *time's rebuke my* anon. conj.

---

1. STOPES: By this time the inland poet had looked upon the sea beating upon some pebbly beach, probably Dover. [For the form *pibled*, see *N. E. D.* under "pebble," where many variant forms are noted, "some going back to O. E., the phonetic relations of which are obscure."]

1–4. LEE: [Cf. Golding's Ovid, *Metam.* xv:]

> As every wave drives others forth, and that that comes behind
> Both thrusteth and is thrust himself; even so the times by kind (etc.).

5. MALONE: ["The main of light" is] the great body of light. So, the "main" of waters. PALGRAVE: When a star has risen and entered on the full stream of light. DOWDEN: The entrance of a child into the world at birth is an entrance into the main or ocean of light. TYLER: The world conceived as though a wide ocean enlightened by the rays of the sun. WYNDHAM: This and the two next lines have primarily and essentially an astrological significance. "Nativity" is a term of astrology denoting the moment of a child's birth in relation to the scheme or figure of the heavens, particularly of the Twelve Houses, at that moment, and it is employed by Sh. almost invariably with this connotation. *Lear*, I, ii, 140: "My nativity was under Ursa Major"; *Per.*, III, i, 32: "Thou hast as chiding a nativity as fire, air, water, earth, and heaven can make"; *1 H. 4*, III, i, 13: "At my nativity the front of heaven was full of fiery shapes." . . . Here, though possibly with a secondary echo of the sea-image from the first quatrain, "main of light" means the hollow sphere of the universe filled with light as conceived in Sh.'s day. Life beginning at a point in time within the shining sphere of the heavens, whose aspect is charged with its fate, crawls to maturity only to be thwarted by their fateful powers. BEECHING: "Nativity" or "birth" is compared to the sun crawling up the sky, called "the main of light" to distinguish it from the "main of waters." [Wyndham's note is of real value, as directing attention to the astrological character of the image, which had curiously escaped earlier commentators, — except perhaps Palgrave. In view of the term "eclipses," however, I think that Beeching is right in taking the figure to have primary reference to the sun. — ED.] LEE: Ovid (*Metam.* xv) describes "Dame Nature" as bringing man out from the womb "[in] to ayre," for him to pass "forth the space of youth," to wear "out his middle age apace," and finally to have his strength "undermined" by age and to be consumed "every whit" by "lingering death." (Golding's trans., ed. 1612, p. 186 a.) [In the *Qu. Rev.*, 210: 473, Lee also calls attention, in connection with the "crawls" of line 6, to Ovid's description of "the baby's early endeavour to crawl." The notion, however, of a child "crawling to maturity" in this literal fashion, is so painful that we may be allowed to forget it. — ED.]

6. **Crawles.** TYLER: Meaning, probably, not merely that the progress is slow but that the condition of mankind is abject. Cf. *Haml.*, III, i, 130: "What should such fellows as I do crawling between heaven and earth?"

7. **Crooked.** SCHMIDT: Malignant. [Cf. *T. G. V.*, IV, i, 22: "Crooked fortune."]

8. **confound.** See note on 5, 6.

9. **transfixe.** SCHMIDT: Transplace, remove. [The word does not occur elsewhere in Sh., and I know not where Schmidt can have got his rendering. Surely the word is generally understood in its common meaning, of a Time like him of Browne's epitaph, who may be expected to "throw a dart at thee." — ED.] **florish.** MALONE: External decoration. SCHMIDT: Gloss, ostentatious embellishment. [Cf. *L. L. L.*, II, i, 14: "The painted flourish of your praise."]

10. MALONE: Cf. 2, 1–2; 19, 9. [With reference to "delves," BEECHING remarks that Time appears not only "with his conventional dart and scythe,"

but "also with a spade." But surely not even Time would be so cruel as to use a spade on the brow of beauty. — ED.]

11. **natures truth.** TYLER: That which is naturally and genuinely beautiful and excellent, as opposed to what is meretricious and artificial. [So BEECHING.] [For "truth," see note on 54, 2. May not the reference be simply to the rare things created by the fidelity of Nature? — ED.]

13. **times in hope.** BULLOCH explains his emendation by saying that "Time's own hour" is "the last hour of time or consummation of all things," and calls attention to the personification in the following line. (p. 283.) DOWDEN: Future times. BEECHING: Schmidt takes "in hope" with "stand," but the previous line shows that "stand" is used absolutely for "endure." [For "in hope" with the meaning "future," cf. *T. of A.*, IV, iii, 527: "Benefit . . . either in hope or present." — ED.]

BEECHING: Note the contrast between the smoothness of the first quatrain, describing the work of Time, in which each line runs to its end like the ripple to which it compares the succession of minutes, and the second quatrain, which by its slowness and repeated breaks suggests the labour of human life which Time hinders at every step. (Intro., p. liii.)

In the MS. book referred to at the end of the notes on S. 2, as having been in the possession of Mr. Bertram Dobell, is a kind of composite sonnet made up of lines 5–12 of S. 60 and lines 3–8 of S. 65. The lines from S. 60 include no textual peculiarities.

61

Is it thy wil, thy Image should keepe open
My heauy eielids to the weary night?
Dost thou desire my slumbers should be broken,
While shadowes like to thee do mocke my sight?
Is it thy spirit that thou send'st from thee
So farre from home into my deeds to prye,
To find out shames and idle houres in me,
The skope and tenure of thy Ielousie?
O no, thy loue though much, is not so great,
It is my loue that keepes mine eie awake,
Mine owne true loue that doth my rest defeat,
To plaie the watch-man euer for thy sake.
For thee watch I, whilst thou dost wake elsewhere,
From me farre of, with others all to neere.

3. **slumbers**] *slumber* But.
6. **prye,**] *pry?* G, E.
8. **tenure**] *tenour* C, M, etc. (except Wy, Wa).
14. **of**] *off* G, etc. **all to neere**] *all too neare* 1640, G[1]; *all too near* G[2], S, E, C, Co, Hu, Dy, Cl, Gl, Wh, etc.; *all-too-near* M, A, Kt, B, Del, Sta; *all-too near* Kly.

MASSEY: A palpable continuation of [S. 43, being one of the group of sonnets on a journey. (p. 91.) See notes on S. 43, for the resemblance to Sidney's *A. & S.* 38.] ROLFE: [Cf. Sonnets 27–28.]

DOWDEN: The jealous feeling of S. 57 reappears in this sonnet.

1–3. **open . . . broken.** [WYNDHAM notes the "assonantal rhyme." Cf. *remember'd: tender'd* in S. 120.] PRICE [comments on the unexpected imperfect rhyme as "delicious." (p. 371.)]

4. WYNDHAM: Cf. 43, 11–12. For "shadows," see note on 37, 10.

7. **shames.** FLEAY [couples this with 72, 13; see his note on that line.] **idle houres.** DOWDEN: Cf. Dedication of *V. & A.*: "I . . . vow to take advantage of all idle hours."

8. **tenure.** WYNDHAM [(see textual notes), keeping the Q spelling, refers to his note on the word in *Lucrece* 1310, where he interprets it in the legal meaning of the transcript or copy of an instrument. Miss PORTER, defending the same form of the word, defines it (for both passages) as a paper or other container. Whatever may be the appropriateness of these renderings for the line in

Lucrece, I am quite unable to understand either of them as applied to the present passage, where the usual Shakespearean meaning of the word (spelled both "tenor" and "tenure" in old texts), viz., essential content or meaning, is obviously applicable. — ED.]

9. BEECHING: The half-amused, half-despondent answer to the sad questions in the first two quatrains is given in a line of almost choking rhythm. (Intro., p. liv.) WALSH: This line suits much better the character of the disdainful mistress than that of the faithful friend.

11. **defeat.** SCHMIDT: Destroy.

13–14. [ISAAC regards these lines as meaningless unless addressed to a woman. (*Archiv*, 61: 419.)]

62

SINNE of selfe-loue possesseth al mine eie,
And all my soule, and al my euery part;
And for this sinne there is no remedie,
It is so grounded inward in my heart.
Me thinkes no face so gratious is as mine,
No shape so true, no truth of such account,
And for my selfe mine owne worth do define,
As I all other in all worths surmount.
But when my glasse shewes me my selfe indeed
Beated and chopt with tand antiquitie,
Mine owne selfe loue quite contrary I read
Selfe, so selfe louing were iniquity,
T'is thee (my selfe) that for my selfe I praise,
Painting my age with beauty of thy daies,

4. **my**] *the* G².

7. **for . . . do**] *for . . . so* Walker conj., Del conj.; *so . . . do* Lettsom conj., Hu²; *for . . . to* Kt. **owne**] *one* S², E.

8. **As I**] *I do* C. **worths**] *worth* But.

10. **Beated**] *'Bated* M¹; *Bated* Walker conj., Hu², R; *Blasted* Stee conj.; *Beaten* Co conj., Kinnear conj., Hu¹, Wh. **chopt**] *chapp'd* Dy, Sta, Wh¹, Co³, Hu².

11. **selfe loue**] Hyphened by L, etc.

12. **selfe louing**] Hyphened by G, etc.

[This sonnet cannot be understood without realizing it as a freshly ingenious treatment of the conceit of "identity," on which see notes on 22 and 36. — ED.]

7. DELIUS: [For "do define," understand "I do define," unless we emend "do" to "so."] DOWDEN: Does "for myself" mean "for my own satisfaction"? ROLFE: Perhaps it merely adds emphasis to the statement. WYNDHAM: My definition of my worth is such that, [etc.] BEECHING: [If the correction "so myself" were adopted, we should also have to read "*does* define,"] as "myself" in Sh. is always followed by the third person of the verb. If any correction is made, it would be better to read "And *I* myself my own worth *so* define," but it is simpler to understand the omission of the personal pronoun understood from "methinks." [The late Professor A. G. NEWCOMER interpreted the line: "I define my own worth as 'just myself,' — there is no other definition possible." Cf. "You alone are you," 84, 2.]

8. **other.** [For this use in the plural, cf. ABBOTT, § 12, and FRANZ, § 224.]

9–10. On the theme of the poet's age, see notes on 22, 1. R. G. WHITE [calls line 10] a very perplexing line, which seems to imply that the poet was not speaking in his own person. VON FRIESEN: In itself it is not unnatural that a man who was married at the age of eighteen and had become a father at the completion of his 19th year, should think of himself as growing old with the approaching thirties. (*Altengland u. William Sh.*, p. 341.) TYLER: I am not very willing to accept the explanation that, on account of the difference in the conditions of life, the signs of age made their appearance sooner three centuries ago than they do now. It is more to the purpose that, as compared with the age of Herbert at 18 ("the world's fresh ornament, and only herald to the gaudy spring," in "the lovely April" of his prime) not only was forty (S. 2), but even thirty-four or thirty-five, a somewhat advanced age. This comparison, expressed or implied, should be kept in view, and we should certainly not lose sight of the hue of melancholy which is so clearly conspicuous in many of the Sonnets between 64 and 94. (Intro., p. 111.) [Tyler is speaking here, it should be noted, not of the present sonnet but of S. 73. — ED.] W. C. HAZLITT: The canon in pastoral poetry of all ages and countries which licenses the fictitious assumption of years, . . . assuredly does not apply here. Is it reasonable to seek or accept any explanation except and beyond the superficial one? Is it necessary? These exercises may be partly at least ascribed to a stage in the life of Sh. when he had reached his prime; some — one almost certainly — were composed as late as 1603, when he was 39, and there is no particular hazard . . . in setting down [Sonnets 2 and 73, examples of this theme of impending age] to the very year when the forty winters [of S. 2] had done their work, and had wrought more than average havoc on a system worn by incessant intellectual labour. (*Sh., Himself and his Work*, p. 264.)

10. **Beated.** MALONE: Perhaps a misprint for "'bated." "'Bated" is properly "overthrown," "laid low," "abated," from *abattre*, Fr. . . . "Beated," however, the regular participle from the verb to "beat," may be right. We had in a former sonnet "weather-beaten face." STEEVENS, [in favor of "blasted," cites *2 H. 4*, I, ii, 207:] "Every part about you blasted with antiquity." DOWDEN [was led by the word "tann'd" to learn that skins are submitted to a process called "bating," though he does not take the suggestion seriously. For

the possible "bated," he cites *M.V.*, III, iii, 32: "These griefs and losses have so bated me." (For this word SCHMIDT gives the meaning "weakened.")] HUDSON [also reading "bated":] In *1 H. 4*, III, iii, 2, Falstaff uses the word in a sense well suited to this place: "Am I not fallen away vilely? . . . do I not bate? do I not dwindle?" TYLER [renders the whole line, "Battered, wrinkled, and darkened," presumably connecting the first word with "beat."] HERFORD: Flayed. Properly an agricultural term (still used in Devonshire) for paring away the sods from moorland. [But how does old age flay the face? — ED.] ROLFE, [for the participle in -ed, compares "splitted," *C. of E.*, I, i, 104; "catched," *L. L. L.*, V, ii, 69; etc.] **chopt.** SCHMIDT: Rent and split with toil or age. [The same word as "chapped" (see *N. E. D.*), which latter form is not found in the early editions of Sh. — ED.] **antiquitie.** SCHMIDT: Old age. [Cf. *2 H. 4*, I, ii, 207, quoted above.]

13. [This and similar lines are the starting-point for KARPF's esoteric theory that the theme of the Sonnets is *die ideale Selbstliebe*. See also note on 22, 5–7.] [After "myself" CRAIG puts comma and dash, apparently taking the following "that" as demonstrative, on what grounds I cannot imagine. — ED.]

MACKAY [takes this sonnet to represent Leicester addressing the Queen (see note on S. 49):] the feelings of his youth and early prime are represented in the first eight lines of the poem — those of his present age (between fifty and sixty) are expressed in the last six. . . . This series of the sonnets forms as complete a dramatic poem as *V. & A.* or *Lucrece*, and . . . depicts with consummate mastery of touch the love of an ambitious man, grown old, for a woman grown old also, whom he loved (truly or selfishly) in his youth, and whom he continues to love, or pretend to love, in his declining years. (*Nineteenth Century*, 16: 257, 259.)

63

AGAINST my loue shall be as I am now
With times iniurious hand chrusht and ore-worne,
When houres haue dreind his blood and fild his brow
With lines and wrincles, when his youthfull morne
Hath trauaild on to Ages steepie night,
And all those beauties whereof now he's King
Are vanishing, or vanisht out of sight,
Stealing away the treasure of his Spring.
For such a time do I now fortifie
Against confounding Ages cruell knife,
That he shall neuer cut from memory
My sweet loues beauty, though my louers life.
His beautie shall in these blacke lines be seene,
And they shall liue, and he in them still greene.

1. **Against**] *Aghast* Bulloch conj.
2. **chrusht**] *crush'd* G, etc.; *frush'd* Stee conj.
5. **trauaild**] *travel'd* G^2, S^2, etc. **steepie**] *sleepy* Hu^2.

[Despite the fact that DOWDEN and ROLFE speak of this sonnet as continuous with the preceding, the thought appears to me much more closely related with that of S. 60, after which WALSH places it in his rearrangement. — ED.]

ISAAC: [With this sonnet cf. Daniel, *Delia*, 33:

> I once may see, when years may wreck my wrong,
> And golden hairs may change to silver wire;

and *ibid.*, 37: "When winter snows upon thy golden hairs."] (*Jahrb.*, 17: 182.)

2. **injurious.** WALSH: Cf. "injurious time," *T. & C.*, IV, iv, 44, which phrase occurs in Lilly's *Endimion*, I, i, and in Spenser's translation of Bellay's *Ruins of Rome*, 27, 6. **chrusht.** STEEVENS [defended his emendation, "frush'd," on the ground that] to say that a thing is first "crush'd," and then "over-worn," is little better than to observe of a man that he was first killed, and then wounded. MALONE: To *frush* is to bruise or batter. What then is obtained by the change?

4. **lines and wrincles.** FLEAY: Cf. Drayton, S. 44, 2: "Age rules my lines with wrinkles in my face." (*Biog. Chron.*, 2: 227.) [Cf. 2, 1–2; 19, 9; 60, 10. — ED.]

5. **steepie.** MALONE: I once thought that the poet wrote "sleepy." But the word "travel'd" shows, I think, that the old copy is right, however incongruous the epithet "steepy" may appear. [Cf. 7, 5–6, which explain what is meant by the "steepy night" of age.] HAZLITT: ["Age's steepy night" is] the precipice of age from which we are to plunge into darkness. DOWDEN, [comparing, like Malone, the "steep-up heavenly hill" of S. 7, explains:] Youth and age are on the steep ascent and the steep decline of heaven. LEE: Another reminiscence of Golding's translation of Ovid's *Metam.*, bk. xv (1612 ed., p. 186a): "Through drooping age's steepy path he (i.e., man) runneth out his race."

9. **For such a time.** BEECHING: Referring back to line 1, "Against [the time when] my love shall be crush'd," etc. **fortifie.** [ROLFE: For the intransitive use cf. *2 H. 4*, I, iii, 56: "We fortify in paper and in figures."] LEE: Cf. Daniel, *Delia*, S. 50, 9–10:

> These are the arks, the trophies I erect,
> That fortify thy name against old age.

10. **knife.** TYLER: Nearly equivalent to Time's scythe.

BRANDL [notes that this sonnet and those that follow, to 68, are not directly addressed to the friend; the poet writes as it were "a tragic monologue to himself." (p. xii.)]

[The structure of the sonnet is unusual in that the principal pauses of the opening portion occur after line 2, in the middle of line 4, and at the ends of lines 5 and 8. — ED.]

64

When I haue seene by times fell hand defaced
The rich proud cost of outworne buried age,
When sometime loftie towers I see downe rased,
And brasse eternall slaue to mortall rage.
When I haue seene the hungry Ocean gaine
Aduantage on the Kingdome of the shoare,
And the firme soile win of the watry maine,
Increasing store with losse, and losse with store.
When I haue seene such interchange of state,
Or state it selfe confounded, to decay,
Ruine hath taught me thus to ruminate
That Time will come and take my loue away.
This thought is as a death which cannot choose
But weepe to haue, that which it feares to loose.

2. **rich proud**] Hyphened by M, A, Kt, B, Del, Hu, Dy, Sta, Cl, Kly, Cam, Do, Ty, Ox, But.

3. **sometime**] *sometimes* G, S, E. **downe rased**] Hyphened by M, etc. (except Kly).

14. **loose**] *lose* G^2, S^2, etc.

PALGRAVE: [Sonnets 64–66] form one poem of marvelous power, insight, and beauty.

LEE [views the sonnet as based on Ovid's account of] the "towers" of Athens and Thebes and other cities of Greece, "ruins of whose ancient works" were overgrown with grass. (*Qu. Rev.*, 210: 472.) [The resemblance to Ovid had been noticed by WALKER, *Crit. Exam.*, 1: 152.] STOPES: Cf. *Lucrece*, 939, 944–48:

> Time's glory is to calm contending kings, . . .
> To ruinate proud buildings with thy hours,
> And smear with dust their glitt'ring golden towers;
> To fill with worm-holes stately monuments,
> To feed oblivion with decay of things,
> To blot old books and alter their contents.

4. **brasse eternall.** [It is curious that this use of "brass," with its echo of "aere perennius," etc., finds no distinct place in the *N. E. D.* — ED.]

5–8. *CAPELL: Cf. *2 H. 4*, III, i, 46–52:

And see the revolution of the times
Make mountains level, and the continent
Weary of solid firmness, melt itself
Into the sea! and, other times, to see
The beachy girdle of the ocean
Too wide for Neptune's hips; how chances mock,
And changes fill the cup of alteration.

STEEVENS: Cf. *1 H. 4*, III, i, 108–11 [of the River Trent:]

Mark how he bears his course, and runs me up
With like advantage on the other side;
Gelding the opposed continent as much
As on the other side it takes from you.

ROLFE: Some critics have expressed surprise that Sh. should know anything of these gradual encroachments of the sea on the land; but they had become familiar on the east coast of England before his day. [He refers to his note on *R. 2*, II, i, 295, with reference to the inroads of the sea which swept away most of the town of Ravenspurg, at the mouth of the Humber, in the 14th century.] LEE: One more of Sh.'s many echoes of the philosophic disquisition in Ovid's *Metam.*, XV:

Even so have places often-times exchanged their estate,
For I have seen it sea which was substantial ground alate.
Again where sea was, I have seen the same become dry land.

[These notes of Rolfe and Lee enable us to make a typical choice between life and literature as sources. — ED.] TYLER: Cf. *In Memoriam*, cxxiii:

There rolls the deep where grew the tree.
O earth, what changes hast thou seen!
There where the long street roars hath been
The stillness of the central sea.

The hills are shadows, and they flow
From form to form, and nothing stands;
They melt like mist, the solid lands,
Like clouds they shape themselves and go.

8. TYLER: Extending its own domain by what the other loses, and losing by what the other gains. **store.** SCHMIDT: Abundance.

9–10. **state . . . state.** SCHMIDT [defines the first by "condition," the second by "pomp." So, in effect, BEECHING and TYLER; but WYNDHAM defines the second as "condition in the abstract," comparing 124, 1, where, however, he is probably also mistaken in his interpretation. For the first use of the word, cf. "estate" in the passage from Golding's Ovid quoted above. — ED.]

13. DOWDEN: This thought, which cannot choose, etc., is as a death.

PRICE: Not less than 10 of the 14 verses [of this sonnet are] linked by assonance on *a*. [By this] the loveliness of verse-movement and the unity of the

sonnet-form . . . are much enhanced. (p. 371.) G. H. PALMER [instances the sonnet as stating most compactly the pervasive theme, as he views it, of the whole series, the transiency of love. In this connection he notes that] the word "time" occurs in the Sonnets 78 times; "death" 21; "age" 18. (pp. 16–19.)

65

SINCE brasse, nor stone, nor earth, nor boundlesse sea,
But sad mortallity ore-swaies their power,
How with this rage shall beautie hold a plea,
Whose action is no stronger then a flower?
O how shall summers hunny breath hold out,
Against the wrackfull siedge of battring dayes,
When rocks impregnable are not so stoute,
Nor gates of steele so strong but time decayes?
O fearefull meditation, where alack,
Shall times best Iewell from times chest lie hid?
Or what strong hand can hold his swift foote back,
Or who his spoile or beautie can forbid?
O none, vnlesse this miracle haue might,
That in black inck my loue may still shine bright.

3. this] *his* M conj., Walker conj., But.
5. hunny] *hungry* 1640, G, S, E. hunny breath] Hyphened by Co, Hu, Kly, Hal.
6. wrackfull] *wreckful* G^2, E, M, A, Kt, Co, B, $Del^{1,2}$, Hu, Dy, Sta, Cl, Gl, Kly, Wh^1, Hal, Cam, Do, But, Her, Be, N.
10. chest] *quest* Th conj.; *theft* Orger conj.
11. his] *this* G, S, E.
12. or] *on* G, S, E; *o'er* C; *of* M, etc.

---

1. ABBOTT: [Between "since" and "brass" there is an ellipsis of "there is neither." Cf. note on 86, 9. (§ 403.)]

1–2. VON MAUNTZ: Cf. Ovid, *Ex Ponto*, IV, viii, 49–50:

> Tabida consumit ferrum lapidemque vetustas,
> Nullaque res maius tempore robur habet.

4. action. DOWDEN: Is the word used here in a legal sense? suggested perhaps by "hold a plea." BEECHING: There is no reference . . . to an action at law; for the comparison is with the physical strength of brass, stone, etc. Cf. *J.C.*, I, iii, 77: "A man no mightier than thyself or me in personal action."

5. **hunny.** [For the word as an adjective, cf. *R. 3*, IV, i, 80: "Grew captive to his honey words." — ED.]

5–6. BEECHING: Summer is represented as besieged by Winter.

6. DOWDEN: Cf. 63, 9. **wrackfull.** [The only occurrence of the word in Sh. The regular Shakespearean form of the noun and verb is "wrack." — ED.]

10. **chest.** MALONE: I once thought Sh. might have written "quest," but am now convinced that the old reading is right. . . . [Cf. "jewels" and "chest" in 48, 5 and 9; *R. 2*, I, i, 180: "A jewel in a ten-times-barr'd-up chest"; etc.] The chest of Time is the repository where he lays up the most rare and curious productions of nature; one of which the poet esteemed his friend. STEEVENS: Time's chest is the repository into which he is poetically supposed to throw those things which he designs to be forgotten. Cf. *T. & C.*, III, iii, 145:

> Time hath, my lord, a wallet at his back,
> Wherein he puts alms for oblivion.

[And 52, 9: "So is the time that keeps you as my chest."] SHARP [defends the change to "quest," saying:] Could a jewel lie hid from a chest? It lies hid from the eager quest of destroying Time. BUTLER: [The emendation is right,] for the following line shows that Time is supposed to be going about in quest of this or that. BEECHING: The expression is elliptical. Where shall what is Times, best jewel be hidden so as to escape being seized and locked up in his chest? [For the rhythm of this line, see note on 5, 7. — ED.]

See note at the end of S. 60, for the appearance of lines 3–8 in a 17th century MS. Line 3 there reads, "O how shall beauty with this rage hold plea"; and in line 5 is the 1640 reading of "hungry" for "honey." These are the only variants.

66

Tyr'd with all these for restfull death I cry,
As to behold desert a begger borne,
And needie Nothing trimd in iollitie,
And purest faith vnhappily forsworne,
And gilded honor shamefully misplast,
And maiden vertue rudely strumpeted,
And right perfection wrongfully disgrac'd,
And strength by limping sway disabled,
And arte made tung-tide by authoritie,
And Folly (Doctor-like) controuling skill,
And simple-Truth miscalde Simplicitie,
And captiue-good attending Captaine ill.
Tyr'd with all these, from these would I be gone,
Saue that to dye, I leaue my loue alone.

2. **borne**] *lorn* Sta conj.
3. **needie**] *empty* or *heavy* Sta conj.
8. **disabled**] *dishabited* Bayne conj.; *discomforted* anon. conj.
11. **simple-Truth**] *simple truth* G, S, M, etc.
12. **captiue-good**] *captive good* G^2, etc.

---

*Capell [was the first to call attention to the resemblance of this sonnet to "Hamlet's celebrated soliloquy." This has been echoed by many commentators, Furnivall remarking that it "must surely be about the *Hamlet* time." The lines especially in question are, of course, those of III, i, 70–75:

For who would bear the whips and scorns of time,
The oppressor's wrong, the proud man's contumely,
The pangs of dispriz'd love, the law's delay,
The insolence of office, and the spurns
That patient merit of the unworthy takes,
When he himself might his quietus make, etc.]

Tyler: The tone of melancholy, which has been previously heard, especially since S. 59, now attains a greater intensity. Massey: Cf. Wordsworth's fine passage [near the end of *The Prelude*, Bk. 3:]

And here was Labour, his own bond-slave; Hope,
That never set the pains against the prize;
Idleness halting with his weary clog,
And poor misguided Shame, and witless Fear,

And simple Pleasure foraging for Death;
Honour misplac'd, and Dignity astray;
Feuds, factions, flatteries, enmity, and guile,
Murmuring submission, and bald government
(The idol weak as the idolater),
And Decency and Custom starving Truth,
And blind Authority beating with his staff
The child that might have led him; Emptiness
Followed as of good omen, and meek Worth
Left to herself unheard of and unknown. (p. 151.)

COPIN [compares the mood of the sonnet with a speech by Alceste in Molière's *Misanthrope*, I, i:]

Mes yeux sont trop blessés, et la cour et la ville
Ne m'offre rien qu'objets â m'échauffer la bile:
J'entre en une humeur noire, en un chagrin profond,
Quand je vois vivre entre eux les hommes comme ils font;
Je ne trouve partout que lâche flatterie,
Qu'injustice, intérêt, trahison, fourberie.
Je n'y puis plus tenir, j'enrage, et mon dessein
Est de rompre en visière à tout le genre humain. (p. 15.)

WALSH: Cf. *Lucrece*, 904–07:

The patient dies while the physician sleeps;
The orphan pines while the oppressor feeds;
Justice is feasting while the widow weeps;
Advice is sporting while infection breeds;

M.V., II, ix, 41–45:

O, that estates, degrees and offices
Were not deriv'd corruptly, and that clear honour
Were purchas'd by the merit of the wearer!
How many then should cover that stand bare!
How many be commanded that command!

and *T. of A.*, IV, iii, 17–18:

The learned pate
Ducks to the golden fool; all is oblique.

P. E. MORE, [grouping the sonnet with the passages above cited from *Hamlet* and *Lucrece*, finds in all three] not the mere commonplace lament over the insufficiency of life, but the poet's own very personal and very bitter experience. . . . The one word that occurs to me as expressive of his feeling is *indignity:* if it were not for the sound of the word in connection with so revered a name I should say *shame* — indignity against the soilure that is forced upon him from contact with the world, shame for his too facile yielding to contamination. [Cf. 29, 1–2; 36, 9–10; 37, 3; 88, 6–7; 90, 2–3; 112, 1–2; 119, 1–2; 121, 1.] (*Shelburne Essays*, 2: 35–37.)

4. **unhappily.** SCHMIDT: Mischievously.

5. TYLER: Cf. *Ecclesiastes*, 10: 5–6: "There is an evil which I have seen under the sun: . . . folly is set in great dignity, and the rich sit in a low place." **misplast.** BEECHING: Put into high place above its desert. Cf. Pandulph's phrase, "the misplac'd John," *K.J.*, III, iv, 133.

8. **disabled.** COLLIER: Here to be pronounced as four syllables. [Elsewhere Sh. treats "redoubled," "enfeebled," "unmingled" in the same way.] ABBOTT: Liquids in dissyllables are frequently pronounced as though an extra vowel were introduced between them and the preceding consonant. (§ 477.) [Some of Abbott's examples are surely dubious, but a sufficient number remain. — ED.] [A considerable discussion of this word was started by T. BAYNE, in his proposal (*N. & Q.*, 7th s., 4: 304) to emend to "dishabited." He argued:] It makes satisfactory metre and plausible rhyme; in its Elizabethan sense of "dislodged" it even strengthens the force and enriches the picturesqueness of the line; and it is a word elsewhere used by Sh. with this precise signification; e.g., *K.J.*, II, i, 220. [The editor (?) added a note suggesting "discomforted." The Q text was defended by D. C. T. (p. 405): "There is nothing unmetrical in the line; the word is tô be pronounced *disabeled*." Also by C. B. M.: "'Disabled' is simply the right word in the place. Strength is turned to its contrary, disabled and made weak, just as faith is forsworn, and maiden virtue strumpeted." Later (5: 61) Brinsley Nicholson wrote to the same effect, but proposing the spelling "disabeled."]

9. **arte.** DOWDEN: Commonly used by Sh. for letters, learning, science. Can this line refer to the censorship of the stage? ROLFE: It may [refer to] legal authority used to suppress freedom of speech. TYLER: In [this and the following line] there seem to be allusions to universities and their technical phraseology. This view accords with the use of "doctor-like," and line 9 (where "art" will denote learning) may be taken to refer to opinions obnoxious to those in authority being forbidden to be expressed and published. GARNETT [(*Literature*, 6: 211; see also in *Jahrb.*, 37: 285) thinks the reference is to the threatened closing of two theatres by the Privy Council, July 28, 1597; perhaps also to Henslowe's difficulty regarding Nash's *Isle of Dogs*, almost at the same time.]

11. **Simplicitie.** MALONE: Folly.

11–12. LOWELL: [Cf. Spenser, *Colin Clout*, lines 727–28:]

> While single Truth and simple Honesty
> Do wander up and down despis'd of all.
>
> (Essay on Spenser, *Works*, 4: 289.)

12. [KEIGHTLEY and TYLER emphasize the apparent personifications here by printing "captive Good" and "Captain Ill." SCHMIDT, on the other hand, lists "captain" here as used adjectively. Through the sonnet generally, most modern editors have hesitated to determine the matter of personification by the use of capitals. WYNDHAM remarks: "Only some of the personifications have capitals in Q. . . . I follow the Kelmscott in generalising the practice." BULLEN does the same.]

14. [It may well be queried, with respect to the person here addressed, whether Sh. would be likely to speak of "leaving alone," through his death, such a personage as either Lord Pembroke or Lord Southampton. — ED.]

[This sonnet is unique in structure, — a single sentence, the final couplet, completing the construction of the opening phrase. So BEECHING:] Sonnets 66 and 129 are unlike the rest in not being written in quatrains, though the rhymes are so arranged. (Intro., p. liii.) PRICE [finds the special charm of the sonnet to be due] to the skilful management of the many polysyllabic words. It is a marvelous triumph of technical skill, a startling experiment in poetic diction. (p. 367.) WALSH: For the tenfold succession of "And," we may notice that Spenser was likewise fond of repeating words at the commencement of lines, though he nowhere equaled this. Thus in his *Amoretti* we find "If" six times successively recurring (15), "Nor" seven times (9), and "Her" eight times (64).

E. H. WILKINS [regards this sonnet as a specimen of the Provençal form called the *enueg*:] The three characteristics of the *enueg* appear: the list, the initial repetition, and the emphatic presence of a word denoting "annoyance." . . . The word "tired," the perfect English equivalent for the idea of *enueg*, introduces the poem, and recurs at the head of the concluding couplet. [Compare Petrarch, *Canzoniere*, 312:

> Né per sereno ciel ir vaghe stelle,
> Né per tranquillo mar legni spalmati,
> Né per campagne cavalieri armati,
> Né per bei boschi allegre fere e snelle; etc.]

Petrarch, beyond doubt, knew specimens of the Italian *noia*, and had the type in mind when he composed this poem. The striking correspondence of Sh.'s sonnet to the medieval formula can hardly indicate acquaintance with Provençal or Italian poems: rather does it prove the real humanity of the *enueg*. (*Mod. Philology*, 13: 112.)

67

Ah wherefore with infection should he liue,
And with his presence grace impietie,
That sinne by him aduantage should atchiue,
And lace it selfe with his societie?
Why should false painting immitate his cheeke,
And steale dead seeing of his liuing hew?
Why should poore beautie indirectly seeke,
Roses of shaddow, since his Rose is true?
Why should he liue, now nature banckrout is,
Beggerd of blood to blush through liuely vaines,
For she hath no exchecker now but his,
And proud of many, liues vpon his gaines?
O him she stores, to show what welth she had,
In daies long since, before these last so bad.

1–2. liue, . . . impietie,] *live? . . . impiety?* G¹, S², E; *live, . . . impiety?* S¹.
6. steale dead seeing] *steal dead seeming* C, Farmer conj., But; *steal dead essence* Bulloch conj.; *steal, dead-seeing*, Verity conj.
7. poore] *pure* Co³ conj.
9. banckrout] *bankrupt* G, etc. (except Bull).
10–12. vaines, . . . gaines?] *veins? . . . gains.* G, etc. (except Wy); *veins; . . . gains?* Wy.
12. proud] *prov'd* C, But. many] *money* Co³ conj.

It may be worth remarking that this sonnet was chosen as the opening selection for the *Poems* of 1640.

3. Tyler: His presence serving as a veil to conceal corruption.
4. lace. Steevens: Embellish. Cf. *R. & J.*, III, v, 8: "What envious streaks do lace the severing clouds." Dowden: Cf. *Macb.*, II, iii, 118: "His silver skin laced with his golden blood." Tyler: May here mean "embellish," though in passages which have been quoted in proof the sense is rather "diversify." [So the *N. E. D.*: "To diversify with streaks of colour."] Beeching: Wear as lace.
5–6. Wyndham: An allusion, perhaps primarily, to the imitation of the friend's beauty by the use of cosmetics among his companions, but, as I submit, also and with deeper intention, to the "false art" of other "eternizers," viz., the rival poets. Cf. 21, 1–3; 68, 14; 82, 9–14; 83, 1–2; 84, 1–2; 85, 1–4.

Note that in *L. L. L.*, II, i, 13–14 ("My beauty . . . needs not the painted flourish of your praise") our poet compares "praise" to "painting"; and in IV, iii, 238–39 he runs on from this illustration:

> Lend me the flourish of all gentle tongues, —
> Fie, painted rhetoric! O, she needs it not;

to a direct allusion to the use of cosmetics (258–60):

> O, if in black my lady's brows be deck'd,
> It mourns that painting and usurping hair
> Should ravish doters with a false aspect.

That is to say, he uses the term "painting" precisely with that double sense which I attribute to it here. BEECHING: The use of cosmetics and false hair . . . seems to have been especially repugnant to Sh. Cf. *T.N.*, I, v, 256; *Haml.*, III, i, 150; *M.V.*, III, ii, 92; *T. of A.*, IV, iii, 144.

6. **seeing.** BULLOCH [explains that his proposed "essence" is the philosophical term, found in *Oth.*, IV, i, 16: "Her honour is an essence that's not seen." (*Studies*, p. 287.)] KINNEAR, [favoring the emendation "seeming," calls "seeing"] an evident and easy misprint, which is found in *R. & J.*, I, i, 185, where the quartos of 1599 and 1609 have "welseeing." (*Cruces*, p. 499.) DOWDEN: ["Dead seeing" is] lifeless appearance. [So, in effect, ROLFE, TYLER, and LEE.] VERITY [explains his punctuation as meaning: Itself looking dead, steal from his living hue.] ["Seeing" is found in Sh. as a verbal noun, but not with any such meaning as "semblance," whereas there are several instances of "seeming" in that use. — ED.]

7. **poore beautie.** TYLER: Beauty indifferent and imperfect. WYNDHAM: Abstract beauty personified and called "poor," as abstract Nature personified (line 9) is stated to be "beggar'd." BEECHING: Insignificant beauty. . . . Sh. is usually faithful to rhetorical parallelism within the quatrain; and here "poor beauty" corresponds to "false painting." **indirectly.** TYLER: By artificial means. VERITY: Wrongfully; cf. *H. 5*, II, iv, 94:

> He bids you then resign
> Your crown and kingdom, indirectly held
> From him, the native and true challenger.

8. **Roses of shaddow.** ROLFE: Imaginary roses. TYLER: [Roses of] mere external appearance. [See notes on "shadow" in 37, 10. — ED.] **Rose.** See WYNDHAM'S note on 1, 2.

11–12. VON MAUNTZ: Cf. Sidney, *A. & S.*, 101, 12–14:

> Nature with care sweats for her darling's sake;
> Knowing worlds pass ere she enough can find
> Of such heaven stuff, to clothe so heavenly a mind.

12. DOWDEN: Nature, while she boasts of many beautiful persons, really has no treasure of beauty except his.

13. **stores.** SCHMIDT: Preserves. [Cf. 68, 13.]

13–14. [Cf. this conceit, repeated in the following sonnet, with the notion of comparing the friend with former ages in Sonnets 59 and 106. — ED.]

68

THUS is his cheeke the map of daies out-worne,
When beauty liu'd and dy'ed as flowers do now,
Before these bastard signes of faire were borne,
Or durst inhabit on a liuing brow:
Before the goulden tresses of the dead,
The right of sepulchers, were shorne away,
To liue a scond life on second head,
Ere beauties dead fleece made another gay:
In him those holy antique howers are seene,
Without all ornament, it selfe and true,
Making no summer of an others greene,
Robbing no ould to dresse his beauty new,
And him as for a map doth Nature store,
To shew faulse Art what beauty was of yore.

1. **the map of daies**] Between commas in G^2, S^2, E.
3. **borne**] *born* G, S, E, Kt, Hu, Dy, Sta, Gl, Wh, Hal, Cam, Do, R, Ox, But, etc.
7. **scond**] *second* 1640, etc.
9. **howers**] *bowers* von Mauntz conj.
10. **it selfe**] *himself* M conj., But.

---

1. **map of daies out-worne.** MALONE: Cf. *Lucrece*, 1350: "This pattern of the worn-out age." FLEAY: [Cf. Drayton, S. 44, where the face is called "the map of all my misery." (*Biog. Chron.*, 2: 227.)]

3. **faire.** See note on 16, 11. **borne.** WYNDHAM: Modern spelling restricts the poet's play on this word: he employs it to mean "borne," but also to suggest "born."

5–8. MALONE: Cf. *M.V.*, III, ii, 92–96:

> So are those crisped snaky golden locks,
> Which make such wanton gambols with the wind
> Upon supposed fairness, often known
> To be the dowry of a second head,
> The skull that bred them in the sepulchre.

HALLIWELL: Cf. Drayton, [*Moon-Calf*:]

> And with large sums they stick not to procure
> Hair from the dead, yea, and the most unclean;
> To help their pride they nothing will disdain.

[See also BEECHING's note on 67, 5–6.] ROLFE: [False hair] was then comparatively a recent fashion. Stow says: "Women's periwigs were first brought into England about the time of the massacre of Paris" (1572). Barnaby Rich, in 1615, says of the periwig-sellers: "These attire-makers within these forty years were not known by that name. . . . But now they are not ashamed to set them forth upon their stalls — such monstrous mop-poles of hair — so proportioned and deformed that but within these twenty or thirty years would have drawn the passers-by to stand and gaze." (Note on S. 20.) LEE: There can be little doubt that Sh. had in mind the wealth of locks that fell about Southampton's neck [as "itself and true" in contrast with what is here scorned]. (*Life*, p. 146.) F. V. HUGO: Dans Sh., ce n'est pas l'homme seulement qui se révolte contre cette mode naissante, c'est l'artiste. Ce qui l'indigne, ce n'est pas seulement la violation des tombeaux, l'outrage fait à la mort; c'est la violation de la nature, c'est l'outrage fait à la beauté vivante. . . . On dirait que Sh. voit déjà se projeter sur le ciel de l'idéal comme une ombre de la solennelle perruque que porte la tragédie de Louis XIV.

10. **Without all ornament.** WYNDHAM: Cf. *M.V.*, III, ii, 74: "The world is still deceiv'd with ornament," [and Bassanio's whole tirade against it]. **it selfe.** MALONE: Surely we ought to read "himself." In him the primitive simplicity of ancient times may be observed; in him, who scorns all adscititious ornaments, who appears in his native genuine state. TYLER: "Itself" would seem to be equivalent to "nature itself." [One may conjecture that the logical subject of this part of the quatrain is the *beauty* of the "antique hours," or some similar notion. For the use of "itself" without formal agreement with the noun referred to, cf. *Much Ado*, IV, i, 83: "Hero itself can blot out Hero's virtue." — ED.]

14. **Art.** For the implication of "artifice," cf. 125, 11.

69

THOSE parts of thee that the worlds eye doth view,
Want nothing that the thought of hearts can mend:
All toungs (the voice of soules) giue thee that end,
Vttring bare truth, euen so as foes Commend.
Their outward thus with outward praise is crownd,
But those same toungs that giue thee so thine owne,
In other accents doe this praise confound
By seeing farther then the eye hath showne.
They looke into the beauty of thy mind,
And that in guesse they measure by thy deeds,
Then churls their thoughts (although their eies were kind)
To thy faire flower ad the rancke smell of weeds,
But why thy odor matcheth not thy show,
The solye is this, that thou doest common grow.

3. **that end**] *thy due* G², S², E; *that due* Tyr conj., C, M, etc.
5. **Their**] *Thy* C, M¹, Gl, Cam, Dy², Del³, Do, Hu², etc.; *Thine* M², A, Kt, Co, B, Del¹·², Hu¹, Dy¹, Sta, Cl, Kly, Wh¹, Hal.
8. **farther**] *further* Hu.
10. **thy**] *their* anon. conj.
11. **churls their**] *their churl* G², S², E.
13. **why**] *why?* S, E.
14. **The solye**] *The soyle* 1640; *The soil* C, Cam, Del³, Do, R, Ox, Wy, But, N, Bull; *The solve* M, A, Kt, Co, B, Del¹·², Hu, Dy, Sta, Cl, Gl, Kly, Wh, Hal, Ty, Her, Be, Wa; *The toil* G, S, E; *The sole* Stee conj.; *The foil* Caldecott conj. (MS.); *Th'assoil* anon. conj.

---

3. **end.** MALONE: The letters that compose the word "due" were probably transposed at the press, and the *u* inverted.
4. **Commend.** [This is one of the three words in the Q whose capitalization WYNDHAM cannot explain. (p. 264.)]
5. **Their.** For the error, see note on 26, 12.
7. **confound.** See note on 5, 6.
9. **beauty of thy mind.** TYLER: Said possibly not without a shade of irony.
10. **thy.** BEECHING: An early and anonymous conjecture is "their." And we may ask, Why should people be called "churls" for judging a man by his own deeds? Moreover, the ensuing sonnet seems to say that the common opinion is slander. But a line in 121, 12, "By their rank thoughts my deeds

must not be shown," implies that deeds are capable of various interpretations, and the impression we get from the sonnet is that the poet believes (or tries to believe) his friend to be really good despite certain lapses. See 95, 13.

13. **But.** KINNEAR [regards the word as being transposed; it really belongs in the next line: "the soil is but (i.e., only) this," etc.] (*Cruces*, p. 499.)

14. **solye.** See the textual notes for the weight of opinion regarding this word. MALONE: ["Solve" = solution.] . . . I have not found the word . . . in any author: but have inserted it rather than print what appears to me unintelligible. STEEVENS: I believe we should read "The *sole* is this"; i.e., here the only explanation lies, this is all. CLARK & WRIGHT: As the verb "to soil" is not uncommon in old English, meaning "to solve," as, for example: "This question could not one of them all soile" (Udal's *Erasmus*, Luke, fol. 154b), so the substantive "soil" may be used in the sense of "solution." The play upon words thus suggested is in the author's manner. VERITY: "Soil" means "blemish"; cf. *Haml.*, I, iii, 15 ("No soil nor cautel doth besmirch the virtue of his will"); the sense being, "the fault which prevents your odour . . . from matching your show is the fact that you grow common." [The *N. E. D.* lists both "soil" and "solve," with the meaning "solution," this line being the sole reference in each case; but with an apparent preference for the former reading.] **common.** BEECHING: Too little choice in your company. Cf. *Cor.*, II, iii, 101: "I have not been common in my love." WALSH [connects the word with 137, 10, and places this sonnet with that as addressed to the mistress.] BRANDL: The bitter word reminds us of *Hamlet*, where the Prince hurls it into the face of his mother before the assembled court ["Ay, madam, it is common"]. (p. xiii.)

GODWIN [believes this sonnet to be addressed by the poet to himself (p. 122.)]

ACHESON [views both 69 and 70 as] a direct criticism of Chapman's "A Coronet for his Mistress Philosophy," as were Sonnets 20–21 of "The Amorous Zodiac." [The evidence adduced for this is the phrasing of line 3, which Acheson thinks involves allusion to various lines of Chapman's, e.g., "Alas! why lent not heaven the soul a tongue" (*Ovid's Banquet*); "Spirit to flesh and soul to spirit giving" (*A Coronet*); and similar "soulful expressions." (*Sh. & the Rival Poet*, pp. 124–25.) Lines 8–9 also refer to some of Chapman's in *The Amorous Zodiac:*

> Your eyes were never yet let in to see
> The majesty and riches of the mind. (p. 138.)]

[With this and the following sonnet cf. 94–96. — ED.]

70

THAT thou are blam'd shall not be thy defect,
For slanders marke was euer yet the faire,
The ornament of beauty is suspect,
A Crow that flies in heauens sweetest ayre.
So thou be good, slander doth but approue,
Their worth the greater beeing woo'd of time,
For Canker vice the sweetest buds doth loue,
And thou present'st a pure vnstayined prime.
Thou hast past by the ambush of young daies,
Either not assayld, or victor beeing charg'd,
Yet this thy praise cannot be soe thy praise,
To tye vp enuy, euermore inlarged,
If some suspect of ill maskt not thy show,
Then thou alone kingdomes of hearts shouldst owe.

1. **are**] *art* 1640, etc.

6. **Their**] *Thy* C, M, etc. **woo'd of time**] *wood oftime* C* conj. (M^1); *wood of time* C* conj. (M^2); *weigh'd of time* Del conj.; *woo'd of crime* Sta conj.; *woo'd of time* But.

13. **ill maskt**] *ill maske* 1640, G^1; *ill, mask* G^2, S, E.

This sonnet has awakened discussion chiefly through its apparent inconsistency with others commonly taken as addressed to the same person. Critics undertake interpretations, naturally, according as they view the unity and continuity of the Sonnets in general. GERVINUS: Compare the joyful wantonness with which, in the former untroubled days, the most opposite reproaches had been made! . . . Here how discontented; "he has passed the ambush"; there, so contented: "temptation follows him, and the pretty wrongs befit him well." A greater austerity, it must be admitted, appears in these later sonnets, and in such a manner as allows us to infer a change of mind in the poet; yet we hear in them still more plainly the voice of jealousy, which grudges to the world and its judgment both his friend's virtues and faults. (Trans., ed. 1883, p. 458.) DOWDEN [ignores the difficulty, being content to connect the sonnet with the next preceding, and remarking that the poet here "defends his friend from the suspicion and slander of the time."] TYLER: His friend's prime was unstained, such an affair as that with the poet's mistress not being regarded, apparently, as involving serious moral blemish. Moreover, there had been forgiveness; and the special reference here may be to some charge of which Mr. W. H. was innocent. But (as in 79) Sh. can scarcely escape the charge of adulation. ROLFE:

[If the person addressed here] is the same young man who is so plainly, though sadly and tenderly, reproved in 33–35, this sonnet must have been written before those. . . . Mr. Tyler's attempt to show that this sonnet is not out of place is a good illustration of the "tricks of desperation" to which a critic may be driven in defence of his theory. (Intro., rev. ed., p. 26.) GOLLANCZ [swallows the camel at once, so to say:] The faults referred to in the earlier sonnets are not only forgiven, but here imputed to slander. LEE: The young man whom the poet addresses [here] is credited with a different disposition and experience [from that of the youth rebuked in 32–35, 40–42, 95–96.] (*Life*, p. 99.) [From this one would suppose that Lee took the sonnet to be addressed to a different person from the earlier ones; but on p. 147 he treats it as being of a considerably later date, on the ground that "the poet no longer credits his hero with juvenile wantonness, but with a 'pure, unstained prime.'" How this change can be explained by assuming the lapse of some years, except through a misunderstanding of Sh.'s use of "prime," I am unable to see. — ED.] ACHESON, [on the other hand, thinks that the tone of this sonnet indicates] a period anterior to the indiscretion of Southampton with the poet's mistress recorded in 33–35 and 40–42. I would therefore give these two sonnets [69–70] a very early date. (*Sh. & the R. P.*, p. 123.) BEECHING: The reconciliation would possibly be simple if we knew all the facts; but even in the sonnets themselves two facts are absolutely luminous: First, that it was the mistress who courted the friend rather than the friend who courted the mistress (46, 62, 133, 134). . . . The second fact is that the group of sonnets in which 70 is included implies that the friend had been keeping bad company and doing things which brought his name into bad repute. [See 69, 9–10, where it is implied that the friend's deeds] were not good deeds. S. 70 indubitably follows 69; but it is, on the surface, as inconsistent with it as with the group 33–35. Whether the explanation be that Sh. was hoping the best and giving precept in the form of praise, we cannot say; but the point to notice here is that as 69 and 70 cannot be separated, the inconsistency cannot be got rid of by the hypothesis of more friends than one. (Intro., p. lxiv.) [This is, however, to beg the question; since if the order is not regarded as fixed by the Q, 69 may *not* belong with 70, but — for example — with 94–96, where Walsh puts it. In other words, the possibility of reading 69 and 70 continuously and consistently is precisely one of the questions to be considered in determining the authenticity of the Q order. — ED.] WALSH: This sonnet cannot be addressed to the friend of former sonnets, unless after he has grown to manhood. HORACE DAVIS: May we interpret these difficult lines thus: the friend's "prime" was his early youth; this had been pure and unstained; while his "young days," meaning his early manhood, were "ambushed" indeed; but he had escaped from the snares (this may refer to his intrigue with the dark woman, with whom he was no longer entangled), and now that all was over Sh. refuses to believe the scandal, and maintains the "sweet flattery" that it was only the slanderous "thoughts" (69, 11) of his churlish enemies that wronged him; he admits, however, that his friend had given reason for the charge that "thou dost common grow."

2. VERITY: [Cf. Marlowe, *Hero & Leander*, i, 285–86:

Whose name is it, if she be false or not,
So she be fair, but some vile tongues will blot?

M. for M., III, ii, 196–98:

No might nor greatness in mortality
Can censure scape; back-wounding calumny
The whitest virtue strikes;

and Sophocles, *Ajax*, 154f.: "Point thine arrow at a noble spirit, and thou shalt not miss."] ROLFE: Cf. *Haml.*, III, i, 139–40: "Be thou as chaste as ice, as pure as snow, thou shalt not escape calumny."

3. MALONE: Slander is a constant attendant on beauty, and adds new lustre to it. [For "suspect" as a noun, cf. *2 H. 6*, III, i, 140: "That you will clear yourself from all suspect."] [Cf. line 13. — ED.]

5. **approve.** SCHMIDT: Prove.

6. **woo'd of time.** MALONE: I strongly suspect [these words] to be corrupt. . . . Perhaps the poet means that, however slandered his friend may be at present, his worth shall be celebrated in all future time. STEEVENS: [Perhaps we may interpret:] If you are virtuous, slander, being the favourite of the age, only stamps the stronger mark of approbation on your merit. I have already shewn, on the authority of Ben Jonson, that "of time" means, of the then present one. [This in a note on *Haml.*, III, i, 70. In the same connection BOSWELL cites *E. M. out of his H.*, "Oh how I hate the monstrousness of time"; and Bedingfield, 1576: "Disorder of tyme, terroure of warres," etc.] *CAPELL: Might we not read: "being *wood* of time"? taking "wood" for an epithet applied to slander, signifying frantic, doing mischief at random. Sh. often uses this old word. HAZLITT: Beloved by future time? WALKER [develops Steevens's suggestion of "time" as "the time," comparing 117, 6; Jonson's Pindaric Ode, "He vexed time, and busied the whole state"; etc. (*Crit. Exam.*, 3: 360.)] DOWDEN [quotes Hunter, *New Illus. of Sh.*, 2: 240, to the same effect, and adds:] "Being woo'd of time" seems, then, to mean being solicited or tempted by the present times. TYLER: This must be taken, it would seem, with "slander" of line 5. The sense then will be that "slander coming under the soothing influence of time will show thy worth to be greater"; or, "slander will turn to praise in course of time." WYNDHAM: I suggest that "time" here, as elsewhere in the Sonnets, = not "the time" or "the times" but Time personified. Cf. 117, 6 [where, however, the meaning is also disputed. — ED.] . . . The sense is: If only you be virtuous, slander doth but approve your worth the greater, since you are woo'd by Time (= wooed and not yet won by Time, an object still for Time's solicitation), for you are in your "pure unstained prime." [BUTLER, and later Mrs. STOPES, think the difficulty is solved by adopting the emendation "oftime."] BEECHING: Courted by the world. For "time" in this sense, cf. S. 117, 6, where it is paraphrased by "unknown minds"; *Haml.*, III, i, 70 ("the whips and scorns of time"), etc. LEE: Wooed by the temptations either of the season of youth or of the present age.

[All these commentators assume the correction of "Their" to "Thy" (see 26, 12, etc.); but Miss PORTER would keep it, reading:] The worth of those whose distinction is such that Time [i.e., the period] woos them, being the greater for that, and greater than that of those who therefore woo them, and slander them.

7. *CAPELL: Cf. *T. G. V.*, I, i, 42:

> As in the sweetest bud
> The eating canker dwells, so eating love
> Inhabits in the finest wits of all.

WALSH: Cf. 35, 4.

10. **Either.** [For the metrical treatment of this word as a monosyllable, see ABBOTT, § 466.]

11–12. **soe . . . To.** [For the omission of "as" in such relatival constructions, see ABBOTT, § 281; cf. *M.V.*, III, iii, 9–10: "So fond to come abroad."]

12. DOWDEN: Prof. Hales writes to me: "Surely a reference here to *F. Q.*, end of Bk. vi. Calidore ties up the Blatant Beast; after a time he breaks his iron chain, 'and got into the world at liberty again,' i.e., is 'evermore enlarged.'" [For the meaning of "enlarge," cf. *H. 5*, II, ii, 40: "Enlarge the man committed yesterday." — ED.]

13–14. ISAAC: Cf. 96, 11–12. (*Archiv*, 62: 19.)

14. **owe.** Cf. 18, 10.

ISAAC [considers it to be impossible to apply to the friend such lines as 9–10 and 13–14; on the other hand they are] well matched with the other verses addressed to a young, attractive, and much courted woman, whose coquettish nature has awakened a certain distrust of her purity. (*Archiv*, 62: 19.)

GODWIN [views the sonnet, like 69, as a soliloquy; the poet says to himself:] If thou art really meritorious such slander proves thy worth the greater, and particularly when it is invited by or instigated by thy youth. (p. 121.)

71

Noe Longer mourne for me when I am déad,
Then you shall heare the surly sullen bell
Giue warning to the world that I am fled
From this vile world with vildest wormes to dwell:
Nay if you read this line, remember not,
The hand that writ it, for I loue you so,
That I in your sweet thoughts would be forgot,
If thinking on me then should make you woe.
O if (I say) you looke vpon this verse,
When I (perhaps) compounded am with clay,
Do not so much as my poore name reherse;
But let your loue euen with my life decay.
Least the wise world should looke into your mone,
And mocke you with me after I am gon.

2. Then] *When* S, E, C; *Than* M, etc.
4. vildest] *vilest* G, etc.

Beeching: Just as in the plays we see the perfect balance between the lyrical and intellectual impulses begin to be overset in *Hamlet*, while in such plays as *Cor.* and *T. & C.* the intellectual impulse has triumphed, so among the sonnets we seem able to distinguish some, such as the group 71–74, which correspond to the *Hamlet* period, and others, such as 123–124, which suggest affinities with *T. & C.* (Intro., p. li.)

2. Malone: Cf. *2 H. 4*, I, i, 102: "A sullen bell, remember'd knolling a departed friend."

4. vildest. [This "corrupt form of *vile*" (*Cent. Dict.*) is very common in the original Shakespearean texts. — Ed.]

10. Malone: Cf. *2 H. 4*, IV, v, 116: "Only compound me with forgotten dust."

See note at the end of S. 32 for a MS. version of this sonnet. The only variant reading — according to Lee's transcript — is "me" for "you" in line 8.

72

O LEAST the world should taske you to recite,
What merit liu'd in me that you should loue
After my death (deare loue) for get me quite,
For you in me can nothing worthy proue.
Vnlesse you would deuise some vertuous lye,
To doe more for me then mine owne desert,
And hang more praise vpon deceased I,
Then nigard truth would willingly impart:
O least your true loue may seeme falce in this,
That you for loue speake well of me vntrue,
My name be buried where my body is,
And liue no more to shame nor me, nor you.
For I am shamd by that which I bring forth,
And so should you, to loue things nothing worth.

6. **me then mine owne**] *me now, than mine own* G¹, S, E; *me now, than my* G².

---

4. **prove.** SCHMIDT: Ascertain, find. [Cf. 153, 7.]

5. **vertuous lye.** VERITY: Did Sh. know of Plato's γενναιον ψευδος or Horace's *splendide mendax?* Cf. Webster, *D. of Mal.*, III, ii: "Such a feigned crime as Tasso calls *Magnanima menzogna*, a noble lie."

7. I. ABBOTT: Euphony and emphasis may have successfully contended against grammar. This may explain "I" in "and I," "but I," frequently used for *me*. . . . The sound of *d* and *t* before "me" was avoided. [Of the present example] the rhyme is an obvious explanation. (§§ 205, 209.)

6. **desert.** For the rhyme with "impart," cf. note on 11, 4.

9–10. TYLER: Lest the reality of your love for me should be questioned or denied, when the falsity of your eulogies has been detected. [SCHMIDT and ROLFE also take "untrue" to be an adverb (= untruly); but WYNDHAM may be right in suggesting that it is in agreement with "me." He paraphrases, "Of me whose poetry is imperfect." Or it may have the general meaning "unworthy." See note on "truth" in 54, 2. — ED.]

12. **shame.** WYNDHAM: Here, as elsewhere, the poet uses terms of moral censure when delivering an artistic judgment. The next two lines prove that the "shame" is for the *verses* he brings forth.

13. FLEAY: [The line merely refers to criticism of his dramatic works as inferior, in contemporary opinion, to his poems.] This word "shame" has the same meaning all through these sonnets, . . . nothing more than the feeling

produced by unfavorable critical opinions. [Cf. S. 112.] (*Macm. Mag.*, 31: 434.) PORTER: The entire tenor of the sequence shows that the artistic judgment is not [Sh.'s] own so much as that of the world of which he is conscious and to which he is so sensitive that he is ready to abandon artistic fame in the external sense, for that genuineness of expression constituting real livingness in his verse. [When I compare this sonnet with 36 and 112, treating also the "shame" motif, I feel less certain than the commentators appear to that it deals wholly or primarily with literary reputation. — ED.]

14. BEECHING: The first notice that Sh.'s friend takes any interest in his poems.

73

THAT time of yeeare thou maist in me behold,
When yellow leaues, or none, or few doe hange
Vpon those boughes which shake against the could,
Bare rn'wd quiers, where late the sweet birds sang.
In me thou seest the twi-light of such day,
As after Sun-set fadeth in the West,
Which by and by blacke night doth take away,
Deaths second selfe that seals vp all in rest.
In me thou seest the glowing of such fire,
That on the ashes of his youth doth lye,
As the death bed, whereon it must expire,
Consum'd with that which it was nurrisht by.
This thou perceu'st, which makes thy loue more strong,
To loue that well, which thou must leaue ere long.

4. **Bare rn'wd quiers**] *Bare ruin'd quires* 1640, G, S, E; *Bare ruin'd choirs* M, etc.; *Barren'wd quiers* L; *Barren'd of quires* C.

5. **twi-light**] *twi-lights* 1640, G[1]; *twilights* G[2], S, E.

13. **This**] *Tis* 1640; *'Tis* G, S, E.

14. **leaue**] *leese* But conj. **long.**] *long:* M, Kt, Co [1,2], Del, Dy, Sta, Kly, Wh[1], Hal, Hu[2], Ty.

1–4. MALONE: Cf. *Cymb.*, III, iii, 60–64:

Then was I as a tree
Whose boughs did bend with fruit; but in one night,
A storm or robbery, call it what you will,
Shook down my mellow hangings, nay, my leaves,
And left me bare to weather;

and *T. of A.*, IV, iii, 263–66:

> That numberless upon me stuck as leaves
> Do on the oak, have with one winter's brush
> Fell from their boughs and left me open, bare
> For every storm that blows.

BRANDL: Cf. Spenser, *Sh. Cal., January:*

> You naked trees whose shady leaves, [etc.] . . .
> All so my lustful leaf is dry and sere. (p. xiv.)

4. **quiers.** MALONE: That part of cathedrals where divine service is performed, to which, when uncovered and in ruins, "A naked subject to the weeping clouds," the poet compares the trees at the end of autumn, stripped of that foliage which at once invited and sheltered the feathered songsters of summer; whom Ford, a contemporary and friend of our author's, with an allusion to the same kind of imagery, calls (in his *Lover's Melancholy*) "the quiristers of the woods." STEEVENS: This image was probably suggested to Sh. by our desolated monasteries. The resemblance between the vaulting of a Gothic aisle, and an avenue of trees whose upper branches meet and form an arch overhead, is too striking not to be acknowledged. When the roof of the one is shattered, and the boughs of the other leafless, the comparison becomes yet more solemn and picturesque. WYNDHAM: This most beautiful image was nearer and more vivid when many great abbeys, opened to the weather within the memory of men living, were beginning to be ruins ere they were forgotten as "chantries, where the sad and solemn priests sing." BEECHING: This superb sonnet has not been without an operation upon its commentators, whose style it has raised.

7. STEEVENS: Cf. *T. G. V.*, I, iii, 87: "And by and by a cloud takes all away."

8. **Deaths second selfe.** LEE: Cf. Daniel's *Delia*, S. 49, which describes sleep as . . . "brother to death." Homer and Hesiod both call sleep the "brother of death." The phrase is used by Ronsard and de Baif; [cf. also Desportes: "O frère de la mort."] [It is also possible that some resemblance between sleep and death had occurred to a number of persons before ever it was embodied in poetry. — ED.]

9–10. **such . . . That.** [See grammatical notes on 34, 7–8.] ABBOTT: In lines 5–6 "such as" is used, because "which" follows; in 9–10 "such that," because "as" follows. (§ 279.)

12. DOWDEN: Wasting away on the dead ashes which once nourished it with living flame. TYLER: The fire and fuel pass away together. BEECHING: Choked by the ashes which once nourished its flame. . . . As ashes certainly can choke flame, so the weakness of the body can react upon the mental powers.

HENRY REED, [referring this sonnet to Sh.'s later years at Stratford, observes:] We challenge the poetry of the world against [the one line, 4, for the image] illustrative of a poet's silent old age. (*Lectures*, 2: 264.) PRICE [finds

that the sonnet shows one of the lowest percentages of foreign words, and is in] the class in which the gem-like radiance of Sh.'s poetical diction is most keenly felt. (p. 365.) [See also his note at the end of S. 33.] [For the structure of the sonnet, the finest example of the Shakespearean mode, see note at the end of S. 49. — ED.]

74

BVT be contented when that fell arest,
With out all bayle shall carry me away,
My life hath in this line some interest,
Which for memoriall still with thee shall stay.
When thou reuewest this, thou doest reuew,
The very part was consecrate to thee,
The earth can haue but earth, which is his due,
My spirit is thine the better part of me,
So then thou hast but lost the dregs of life,
The pray of wormes, my body being dead,
The coward conquest of a wretches knife,
To base of thee to be remembred,
The worth of that, is that which it containes,
And that is this, and this with thee remaines.

1. **contented when**] *contented, when* G², S, E; *contented: when* M, etc. (except Kly, R²); *contented; when* Kly, R².
6. **consecrate**] *consecrare* L.
8. **spirit**] *sprite* S, E.
12. **To**] *Too* G, etc. **remembred**] *remembered* G², S¹, M, etc.

DOWDEN: S. 74 seems to me like an envoy. Perhaps a new MS. book begins with 75–77.

1–2. BEECHING: There is perhaps nothing, even in the sonnets, equal in dignity and beauty to this calm opening.

1. **fell arest.** *CAPELL: Cf. *Haml.*, V, ii, 347–48: "Had I but time, — as this fell sergeant, death, is strict in his arrest."

2. **all bayle.** ROLFE: [Cf. "without all ornament," 68, 10, for the use of all = any.] VERITY: Said in allusion to the legal phrase "without bail and mainprize," a summary form of arrest.

3. **interest.** See note on 31, 7.

6. TYLER: Cf. Martial, *Ep.* vii, 84, "Certior in nostro carmine vultus erit."

The language of our text is stronger, speaking of the inner man, which is thoroughly identified with the written verse (line 8). **part was.** [For the omission of the relative, see ABBOTT, note on 4, 4.]

8. **better part.** TYLER: [Cf. Drayton, *Idea*, 44: "Where I entomb'd my better part shall save."] (Intro., p. 41.) LEE: Cf. 39, 2 [and note]. PORTER: Cf. Horace, Ode 30: "Non omnis moriar; multaque pars mei vitabit Libitinam."

11. DOWDEN: Does Sh. merely speak of the liability of the body to untimely or violent mischance? Or does he meditate suicide? Or think of Marlowe's death, and anticipate such a fate as possibly his own? Or has he, like Marlowe, been wounded? Or does he refer to dissection of dead bodies? Or is it "confounding age's cruel knife" of 63, 10? [FURNIVALL had already made the last of these suggestions, and PALGRAVE the next preceding, saying that the line] must allude to anatomical dissection, then recently revived in Europe by Vesalius, Fallopius, Paré, and others. ROLFE: If not a merely figurative expression, like ["age's cruel knife,"] the key to it is probably in [Dowden's first question:] this life which is at the mercy of any base assassin's knife. [PLUMPTRE (*Contemp. Rev.*, 55:584) argues for the theory of meditated suicide, associating the passage with the "fevered melancholia" of 147 and other sonnets. TYLER agrees with the "assassin" theory. VERITY calls attention, in addition to the knife of 63, 10, to Time's "crooked knife" in 100, 14. VON MAUNTZ (in a note on 100, 14) compares the "death's sharp knife" of Sidney's *Arcadia* (Bk. 2; ed. 1590, f. 241).] WYNDHAM: Metaphorical: the destruction of the body by death and its subsequent corruption is a squalid tragedy. BEECHING: I incline to Dowden's last suggestion, and take the "wretch" to be Death, but the image is derived from the "arrest without bail" in lines 1–2. Death is the executioner. For "coward," cf. *M. for M.*, III, i, 15: "Thou'rt by no means valiant."

12. **remembred.** WYNDHAM: There is little authority [for the modern spelling.] The verb is almost invariably "remembre" in the writings of Sh. and his contemporaries. If so, the line is defective; cf. 66, 8, "disabled." [Nevertheless, Wyndham puts "rememberèd" in his text.]

14. DOWDEN: That (my spirit) is this (my poems).

75

So are you to my thoughts as food to life,
Or as sweet season'd shewers are to the ground;
And for the peace of you I hold such strife,
As twixt a miser and his wealth is found.
Now proud as an inioyer, and anon
Doubting the filching age will steale his treasure,
Now counting best to be with you alone,
Then betterd that the world may see my pleasure,
Some-time all ful with feasting on your sight,
And by and by cleane starued for a looke,
Possessing or pursuing no delight
Saue what is had, or must from you be tooke.
Thus do I pine and surfet day by day,
Or gluttoning on all, or all away,

2. **sweet season'd**] Hyphened by M, etc. **shewers**] *showers* L, M, etc.
3. **peace**] *price* or *sake* M conj.; *prize* Sta conj., But.
8. **betterd**] *better* Isaac conj.

This sonnet was omitted from the 1640 *Poems* and the editions based thereon.

BEECHING: This sonnet . . . would come better after 52.

2. **sweet season'd.** SCHMIDT: Well tempered. [For "season," cf. *Haml.*, I, ii, 192: "Season your admiration for a while."] TYLER: Seasonable and refreshing.

3. **peace.** MALONE: The context seems to require that we should rather read "price" or "sake." The conflicting passions described by the poet were not produced by a regard to the ease or quiet of his friend, but by the high value he set on his esteem: yet as there seems to have been an opposition intended between "peace" and "strife," I do not suspect any corruption in the text. [An admirable specimen, for editors, of how one may annotate a difficult passage at considerable length without offering an explanation! — ED.] DELIUS [takes "peace" to mean "love"; SCHMIDT, "concord or reconciliation."] STAUNTON [supports his emendation "prize" by a reference to 86, 2. (*Ath.*, Dec. 6, 1873, p. 732.)] ISAAC, [referring to MASSEY'S view that the sonnet is supposed to be spoken by Southampton to Miss Vernon when seeking a reconciliation after his absence, observes that a similar interpretation of this line is possible whether Sh. himself is the lover or is describing objectively a love

blossoming in secret. Or, the "peace" may be concerned with the conventional "strife" of lover and lady; see Petrarch, *passim*, and Spenser, Sonnets 10–12, 14, 57. In this connection he quotes the translation of the line in Tschischwitz's version:

Um Ruh mit dir muss ich den Kampf beginnen.

(*Archiv*, 61: 183–84.)]

DOWDEN: The peace, content, to be found in you. [So BEECHING.] TYLER: Peaceable possession of you. WYNDHAM: Peace of possessing your love. [Lines 5–6 would seem to be pretty good evidence for some such interpretation as Tyler's. — ED.]

6. DOWDEN: Perhaps this is the first allusion to the poet, Sh.'s rival in his friend's favour. WYNDHAM: The note struck here, and in the next sonnet, with its reminiscence of 32, seems prelusive to Group E (78–86). [Cf. 48, 13. — ED.]

8. **betterd.** SCHMIDT [observes that the word here approaches the meaning "surpassed." ISAAC glosses the passage, "Counting (myself) better'd in that," etc. (*Archiv*, 61: 185.)]

10. **starved.** Cf. 47, 3 and MALONE's note.

13–14. For the "chiastic" construction, in this case in inverted order, cf. note on 27, 13–14.

14. **all away.** MALONE: Having nothing on my board, — all being away. STEEVENS: Perhaps [the meaning is] "Away with all!" i.e., I either devour like a glutton what is within my reach, or command all provisions to be removed out of my sight. [This suggestion, it need hardly be remarked, has not commended itself to any other commentator. — ED.]

ISAAC [calls this a love-sonnet, approving MASSEY's observation, respecting line 6, that there was no man-stealing in the Elizabethan age. So viewed, the sonnet] is an unsurpassed specimen of its type, and the peer of the best that has ever been sung on this inexhaustible, eternal theme. (*Archiv*, 61: 183.) BRANDES: We have here an exact counterpart to the following expressions in a letter from Michael Angelo to Cavalieri [his young man friend], dated July 1533: "I would far rather forget the food on which I live, which wretchedly sustains the body alone, than your name, which sustains both body and soul, filling both with such happiness that I can feel neither care nor fear of death while I have it in my memory." (*William Sh.*, 1: 349.) WALSH: [This, together with S. 52, forms] a pæan of love, unlikely to be addressed to a friend, and not in conformity with his relation to the dark mistress. They may have been addressed to some other mistress, real or imaginary, or even to his wife. VON MAUNTZ [conceives the sonnet to be addressed, not to any particular person, but to love in the abstract.]

HORACE DAVIS: This sonnet seems to gather in itself parts of 47, 48, 52, and 56. Cf. especially, line 1 with 52, 1; line 4 with 52, 1–3; line 6 with 48, 8; line 9 with 47, 5–6; lines 9–10 with 56, 1–6.

76

WHY is my verse so barren of new pride?
So far from variation or quicke change?
Why with the time do I not glance aside
To new found methods, and to compounds strange?
Why write I still all one, euer the same,
And keepe inuention in a noted weed,
That euery word doth almost fel my name,
Shewing their birth, and where they did proceed?
O know sweet loue I alwaies write of you,
And you and loue are still my argument:
So all my best is dressing old words new,
Spending againe what is already spent:
For as the Sun is daily new and old,
So is my loue still telling what is told,

7. **fel**] *tell* C, M, etc.; *spell* Nicholson conj.
8. **where**] *whence* C, Co^3, Hu^2, But.

This was also omitted from the *Poems* of 1640 and editions based thereon.

DOWDEN: Is this an apology for Sh.'s own sonnets, of which his friend begins to weary? BEECHING: This sonnet opens a new section dealing with the poet's verse and that of other writers. We have already had one sonnet on this topic (32). If 76 and 77 were interchanged, the subject would run on without a break.

MACKAIL [finds the sonnet, especially lines 1–8, to have significance respecting the problem of the date. It] indicates clearly . . . that Sh. was deliberately using a poetical form which was passing out of vogue, but in which his genius saw hitherto unreached possibilities. . . . Up to 1603 at least he persisted, as he puts it, in "dressing old words new, spending again what is already spent." The apology he makes is not only, is not even mainly, for any deficiency in his own powers; it is for persisting in the use of a poetical manner which was regarded as obsolete, a poetical form which had fallen out of fashion. [Cf. 79, 3–4, and 82, 7–8.] But in these phrases there is an accent, if not of sarcasm, at least of pride. (*Lect. on Poetry*, 198–200.)

2. **quicke.** SCHMIDT: Lively.

3–4. TYLER: These lines may allude to Sh.'s unwillingness to adopt the mode of expression and the poetical form employed by his rivals. WYNDHAM: [Cf. 32, 4–8; 125, 5–7, with note.]

4. KRAUSS: Cf. Sidney, *A. & S.*, S. 3:

> Ennobling new-found tropes with problems old,
> Or with strange similes enrich each line.

(*Jahrb.*, 16: 176.)

TYLER: [The words] may very well refer to the novel compound words employed by Chapman to express Homeric epithets. LEE: Cf. for like comment on contemporary sonneteers' extravagances 21, 38, and 130. [For the "compounds strange," see also LEE's remarks on the "compound epithet" as introduced into Elizabethan poetry from that of the *Pléiade*, *French Renaissance in England*, pp. 245–48. He quotes the satires of Joseph Hall, 1597–98, as to the current habit "in epithets to join two words in one," and observes that Sh. himself adopted it freely in the coining of such epithets as "honey-heavy," "giant-rude," "marble-constant," etc.] Every reader of Sh.'s text will recall the frequency of double epithets which, in the best original editions, are, as in the French books, carefully hyphened by the printer.

6. **invention.** ROLFE: [For the meaning, poetic faculty, cf. 38, 8.] **noted weed.** STEEVENS: A dress by which it is always known, as those persons are who always wear the same colours. BEECHING: This passage . . . is one of the stock texts with the wiseacres who think that the sonnets were written by Francis Bacon. They explain "noted weed" to mean "a disguise," which is exactly what it does not mean. [This Baconian misinterpretation had already been noted by W. E. ORMSBY, *N. & Q.*, 9th s., 10; 126.]

9–10. LEE: Cf. Sidney, *A. & S.*, S. 90:

> For nothing from my will or wit doth flow,
> Since all my words thy beauty doth indite.

[See also Lee's note on S. 38.]

10. **argument.** See note on 38, 3.

77

THY glasse will shew thee how thy beauties were,
Thy dyall how thy pretious mynuits waste,
The vacant leaues thy mindes imprint will beare,
And of this booke, this learning maist thou taste.
The wrinckles which thy glasse will truly show,
Of mouthed graues will giue thee memorie,
Thou by thy dyals shady stealth maist know,
Times theeuish progresse to eternitie.
Looke what thy memorie cannot containe,
Commit to these waste blacks, and thou shalt finde
Those children nurst, deliuerd from thy braine,
To take a new acquaintance of thy minde.
These offices, so oft as thou wilt looke,
Shall profit thee, and much inrich thy booke.

1. **were**] *wear* G^2, etc.
3. **The**] *These* C, M conj., But.
4. **this booke**] *thy book* M conj.
6. **thee**] *the* 1640, G, S.
10. **blacks**] *blanks* Th conj., C_t, M, etc.
13–14. [E prints lines 13–14 of S. 108.]
14. **thy**] *my* C.

C. A. Brown [makes this the envoy of the "third poem," 56–77.]

STEEVENS: Probably this sonnet was designed to accompany a present of a book consisting of blank paper. MALONE: This conjecture appears to me extremely probable. We learn from S. 122 that Sh. received a table-book from his friend. In his age it was customary for all ranks of people to make presents on the first day of the new year. BRINSLEY NICHOLSON [(*N. & Q.*, 4th s., 3: 166) suggests that the sonnet was written in a table-book "having a looking-glass and a portable dial on or in either cover." See *A. Y. L.*, II, vii, 20 ("And then he drew a dial from his poke") for evidence that dials were worn by people of the court; and *R. 2*, IV, i, 276 ("Give me that glass") for a suggestion that mirrors were also carried by "male fashionables."] [This last is a decided slip, as line 268 reads, "Go some of you and fetch a looking-glass." — ED.] DOWDEN: If I might hazard a conjecture, it would be that Sh., who had perhaps begun a new manuscript-book with S. 75, . . . here ceased to write, knowing that his friend was favouring a rival, and invited his friend to fill up the blank pages

himself. MASSEY: This book was referred to in S. 37 [error for 38], where, as we saw, the poet was no longer to write on any common or "vulgar paper," but in the book which Southampton had provided for the special purpose. . . . He wants his friend to write in the book of sonnets as a means of drawing him out of self, and set him brooding on his thoughts of love instead of grizzling over his ill fortunes. (p. 157.) TYLER: The view is probably correct . . . which infers that when [this and the two preceding sonnets] were sent to Mr. W. H. there was sent with them a present consisting of a mirror, a sun-dial, and a manuscript-book, each of these being in some sort symbolical. SHINDLER: [The sonnet] accompanied a present, evidently to some more distant friend than the "lovely boy." (*Gent. Mag.*, 272: 81.) BUTLER: My friend Mr. H. Festing Jones suggests to me that the book [was a book of tablets; cf. S. 122,] and that the two friends probably each made the other a present of a book of tablets on the occasion of a New Year's day — Sh. writing S. 77 on the first leaf of the book he gave to Mr. W. H. (p. 97.) BEECHING: The phrases in lines 3 and 10, "*the* vacant leaves," "these *waste* blanks," seem to imply that the album was not altogether unwritten in; but they would be justified if the dedicatory sonnet occupied the first page. The sonnet is so out of key with what precedes and follows it, that it is best to treat it as an occasional poem to which we have not the complete clue. The "wrinkles" of line 5 makes it impossible to regard it as an envoy to the sonnets before it. ROLFE: That the sonnet refers to the present of a blank-book to his friend seems quite certain, but I cannot believe that it was partly filled with Sh.'s poems. That the dial and mirror were also included in the gift is possible but not probable — unless "Thy" in lines 1 and 2 should be "The," as in 3. [Mrs. STOPES and BRANDL accept Nicholson's theory that the mirror and dial were attached to the book.]

4. **this booke.** MALONE: [For the proposed "thy," cf. line 14.] **this learning.** DOWDEN: Beauty, Time, and Verse formed the theme of many of Sh.'s sonnets; now that he will write no more, he commends his friend to his glass, where he may discover the truth about his beauty; to the dial, where he may learn the progress of time; and to this book, which he himself — not Sh. — must fill. TYLER: The lesson is that [despite the warning given by wrinkles and the shadow on the dial] security against oblivion may be found by committing thought to writing. BEECHING: What the glass and dial have taught thee.

5. Here should perhaps be recalled the implication in SHINDLER's and BEECHING's notes on the sonnet as a whole, to the effect that this cannot well be addressed to the beautiful youth (for example, of S. 104).

6. **mouthed.** MALONE: All-devouring. [Cf. "swallowing grave," *V. & A.*, 757.] SCHMIDT: Gaping. ABBOTT: [By a curious use of passive participles], a participle formed from an adjective means "made (the adjective)," and derived from a noun means "endowed with (the noun)." (§ 294.)

7. **shady stealth.** SCHMIDT: Stealing shadow. [For the inverted relationship of adjective and noun, cf. notes on 9, 14; 36, 6; 51, 6.] BEECHING: Cf. 104, 10.

8. **theevish.** MALONE: Cf. *A.W.*, II, i, 169: "The thievish minutes how they pass."

10. **blacks.** DYCE [explains the error for "blanks" as being due to the MS. form "blācks."] BRINSLEY NICHOLSON [(*N. & Q.*, 7th s., 11: 24) favors retaining the Q reading, as referring to tables of black slate. The use of this is mentioned in Douce's *Illustrations* (1839, p. 454), with an engraving from Gesner (1565), where such a table-book is described, "Pugillaris e laminis saxi nigri fissilis, cum stylo ex eodem."] Miss PORTER [also suspects that the "blacks" should stand, but in the sense of] printers' types, marks of life actually laid waste to nourish them, and which is spent upon them for the sake of the life of the spirit they betoken. [Cf. 63, 13 and 65, 14.] [Here one is tempted to ask, Who shall comment upon the commentator? — ED.]

11. TYLER: "Children of the brain" have taken the place of the natural children of the first sonnets.

12. DOWDEN: Perhaps this is said with some feeling of wounded love — my verses have grown monotonous and wearisome; write yourself, and you will find novelty in your own thoughts. VERITY: Reading over what you have written, you will realize the change which has gone on in your own nature and character; . . . thus you will appreciate the double change, outward and inward, that has taken place in yourself.

13. **offices.** SCHMIDT: Functions, agencies. BEECHING: The offices of glass, dial, and book.

[This is another of the sonnets in which GODWIN believes the poet is addressing himself:] "That mirror yonder, hanging on the wall, informs thee how thy good looks are wearing away; that Dutch clock ticking on the mantelpiece shows thee the rapid passage of time; . . . but these vacant leaves destined to receive the imprint of thy mind, will form a book and give thee a taste of a different kind of learning. . . . These waste leaves . . . will deliver the children nursed in thy brain into actual life, and thereby furnish thee with a new acquaintance with thy mind. Moreover this service, as often as it shall be repeated, will add to thy proficiency as a writer." (pp. 61–62.)

78

So oft haue I inuok'd thee for my Muse,
And found such faire assistance in my verse,
As euery *Alien* pen hath got my vse,
And vnder thee their poesie disperse.
Thine eyes, that taught the dumbe on high to sing,
And heauie ignorance aloft to flie,
Haue added fethers to the learneds wing,
And giuen grace a double Maiestie.
Yet be most proud of that which I compile,
Whose influence is thine, and borne of thee,
In others workes thou doost but mend the stile,
And Arts with thy sweete graces graced be.
But thou art all my art, and doost aduance
As high as learning, my rude ignorance.

6. **flie**] *flee* in copy of Q in Bridgewater Library.
7. **learneds**] *learnedst* anon conj.

1–4. WALSH: Cf. 79, 1. Sh. claims to have been the first to sing the praises of this patron.

3. WYNDHAM [considers this line, together with 83, 12, as proof that there were more rival poets than one. (p. 251.) This is doubted by TYLER.] **Alien.** SCHMIDT: Belonging to another. [The capital and italics here have, as usual, led to various conjectures. (For the general subject, see notes on 1, 2.) HENRY BROWN thinks a pun is intended: "a lean pen"; cf. the possible pun in 84, 5. CREIGHTON finds an extraordinary anagram, involving the names of both Daniel and Alleyn. (*Blackwood*, 169: 677.)] **got my use.** DOWDEN: Acquired my habit (of writing verse to you.)

4. **disperse.** ABBOTT: The plural nominative is implied from the previous singular noun. (§ 412.)

5–6. BUTLER: Surely these lines afford considerable ground for thinking that Sh. had not written at all before falling in with Mr. W. H.

6. **heavie ignorance.** MALONE: Cf. *Oth.*, II, i, 144: "O heavy ignorance!"

6–7. VON MAUNTZ: Cf. Sidney, *A. & S.*, 90, 9–11:

> Ne if I would, I could just title make,
> That any laud to me thereof should grow,
> Without my plumes from others' wings I take.

WALSH: Cf. Spenser, in a dedicatory sonnet prefixed to the *F. Q.*, addressed to the Earl of Essex:

> But when my Muse, whose feathers, nothing flit,
> Do yet but flag, and lowly learn to fly,
> With bolder wing shall dare aloft to sty (= rise).

7. **learneds.** ABBOTT [lists this as an instance of an adjective inflected like a noun, though he suspects that the reading should be "learned'st." (§ 5.)] DYCE: Cf. Spenser, *Tears of the Muses:*

> Each idle wit at will presumes to make,
> And doth the learneds task upon him take.

TYLER: The word suits very well the Greek scholar, Chapman. "A double majesty" [of line 8 is also] an expression quite suitable [to the] Homeric translation.

8. MASSEY: A poet is here praised for the sensuous grace of his poetry and majesty of his music; . . . the very qualities of all others that we, following the Elizabethans, associate with the march of Marlowe's "mighty line." (p. 163.)

9. **compile.** SCHMIDT: Compose. [Cf. 85, 2, and *L. L. L.*, IV, iii, 134: "Did never sonnet for her sake compile."]

10. **influence.** SCHMIDT: Inspiration.

12. **Arts.** DOWDEN: Learning. TYLER: There is reference here to poetical style.

13. **advance.** SCHMIDT: Raise to a higher worth. [Cf. *Lucrece*, 1705: "My low-declined honour to advance."]

[For theories as to the "rival poet" or poets, see further the notes on Sonnets 80, 85, 86, and the Appendix. As to the present sonnet, HENRY BROWN (p. 183) thinks that it has particular reference to Francis Davison, who dedicated his *Poetical Rhapsody* (1602) to Pembroke in the following lines:]

> Great Earl whose high and noble mind is higher,
> And noble than thy noble high desire:
> Whose outward shape though it most lovely be,
> Doth in fair robes, a fairer soul attire;
> Who rich in fading wealth in endless treasures
> Of virtue, valour, learning, richer art,
> Whose present greatest men esteem but part
> Of what by line of future hopes thy measure! . . .
> I consecrate these rhymes to thy great name,
> Which if thou like they seek no other fame.

MASSEY [finds in it references to rivals who, on the other hand, were under the patronage of Southampton:] He specifies two or three of these by personifying certain of their well-known qualities. . . . Sh. stands for Ignorance confessed. . . . Tom Nash had posed himself as one of the Learned in opposition to the supposed illiterate player. Tom Nash also wielded an "alien pen" in the spirit

of an Ishmaelite. . . . [Sh.] says, in effect, that the Earl has, in patronising Nash, returned those feathers to the wing of Learning which he, Sh., had been publicly charged by Greene and others with purloining. . . . [Lines 12–13 signify that] Southampton's patronage and friendship made Sh. equal to either the Man of Learning, who was not M. A., or the Man of Arts, who was. . . . Marlowe was a Master of Arts. (pp. 160, 163.)

J. M. ROBERTSON [speaks of this and the related sonnets as avowing Sh.'s lack of classic culture, and his consciousness of being outbraved by the learning of others. They] cannot rationally be supposed to come from the competent classicist pictured by Professor Fiske and further magnified by Professor Collins and the Baconians. (*Sh. and Montaigne*, pp. 340–41.)

79

WHILST I alone did call vpon thy ayde,
My verse alone had all thy gentle grace,
But now my gracious numbers are decayde,
And my sick Muse doth giue an other place.
I grant (sweet loue) thy louely argument
Deserues the trauaile of a worthier pen,
Yet what of thee thy Poet doth inuent,
He robs thee of, and payes it thee againe,
He lends thee vertue, and he stole that word,
From thy behauiour, beautie doth he giue
And found it in thy cheeke: he can affoord
No praise to thee, but what in thee doth liue.
Then thanke him not for that which he doth say,
Since what he owes thee, thou thy selfe doost pay,

2. **thy**] *the* E.
6. **trauaile**] *travell* 1640; *travel* G¹, S¹.

---

5. **lovely argument.** ROLFE: The theme of your loveliness. Cf. 38, 3.

8–9. TYLER: Notice the derogatory expressions "robs" and "stole." [But they are *not* derogatory, or are far from necessarily so, in the present connection, being the natural expression of the conceit of the sonnet. The point is not insignificant, because a number of critics have assumed that the tone of these sonnets is such as to indicate animosity between Sh. and the "rival poet." I find nothing in them which would not be appropriate if the two were excellent friends. See WALSH'S note on 80, 2. — ED.]

80

O How I faint when I of you do write,
Knowing a better spirit doth vse your name,
And in the praise thereof spends all his might,
To make me toung-tide speaking of your fame.
But since your worth (wide as the Ocean is)
The humble as the proudest saile doth beare,
My sawsie barke (inferior farre to his)
On your broad maine doth wilfully appeare.
Your shallowest helpe will hold me vp a floate,
Whilst he vpon your soundlesse deepe doth ride,
Or (being wrackt) I am a worthlesse bote,
He of tall building, and of goodly pride.
Then If he thriue and I be cast away,
The worst was this, my loue was my decay.

9. **a floate**] *a-float* G², S, E; *afloat* C, M, etc.; *aloft* R² [error].
11. **wrackt**] *wreck'd* G², S², E, M, A, Kt, Co, B, Del¹,², Hu, Dy, Sta, Cl, Gl, Kly, Hal, Cam, Do, Wh², Ty, Wy, But, Her, Be, N.

---

2. **better spirit.** MALONE: Curiosity will naturally endeavour to find out who this "better spirit" was, to whom even Sh. acknowledges himself inferior. There was certainly no poet in his own time with whom he needed to have feared a comparison; but these sonnets being probably written when his name was but little known, and at a time when Spenser was in the zenith of his reputation, I imagine he was the person here alluded to. MAIN: A memorable instance of that noble modesty . . . which would seem to be characteristic of the very greatest natures. The reader will call to mind Burns's tribute to Ferguson, Coleridge's to Bowles, Scott's to Miss Ferrier, etc. WALSH: Spenser was the only "better spirit" at the time whose competition Sh. need have feared. Sh. and Spenser are believed to have been friends. But there is not a word in these sonnets that indicates anything else than a friendly rivalry.

5–8. VON MAUNTZ: Cf. Ovid, *Tristia*, 2, 327–30:

Arguor immerito. Tenuis mihi campus aratur:
Illud erat magnae fertilitatis opus.
Non ideo debet pelago se credere, si qua
Audet in exiguo ludere cumba lacu.

[To which might be added, with special reference to line 9, the dedicatory lines which Von Mauntz notes in connection with S. 26, from the *Fasti*, I, 3–4:

Excipe pacato, Cæsar Germanice, voltu
Hoc opus et timidae dirige navis iter.]

6. **humble . . . proudest.** ABBOTT: The *-est* of the second adjective modifies the first. Cf. "The soft and sweetest music" (Jonson). (§ 398.)

7. **inferior farre.** TYLER: Not to be taken too literally.

7–10. STEEVENS: Cf. *T. & C.*, I, iii, 34–44:

The sea being smooth,
How many shallow bauble boats dare sail
Upon her patient breast, making their way
With those of nobler bulk!
But let the ruffian Boreas once enrage
The gentle Thetis, and anon behold
The strong-ribb'd bark through liquid mountains cut, . . .
where's then the saucy boat
Whose weak untimber'd sides but even now
Co-rivall'd greatness?

LEE: Sh. seems to write with an eye on Barnes's [metaphor in *P. & P.*, S. 91:]

My fancy's ship tossed here and there by these
Still floats in danger ranging to and fro.
(*Life*, p. 134.)

10. **soundlesse.** SCHMIDT: Unfathomable.

MASSEY: I can have no doubt that [this sonnet] marks the moment of Sh.'s first venture in publishing his poem of *V. & A.* His "saucy bark" is about to be launched. . . . The dedicatory nature of the sonnet, especially of line 9, may be glossed by the dedicatory Epistle to *Euphues*, in which Lily had said to his patron, "If your lordship with your little finger do but hold me up by the chin, I shall swim." There is a tint of the most delicate modesty in the plea that if he sinks while Marlowe swims, his love for the friend, his desire to do him honour, will be the cause of his "decay." (pp. 167–68.)

W. C. HAZLITT [is disposed to think that the sonnet refers to Griffin, who published his *Fidessa* in 1596.] His sonnets, like those of Sh., may have been in existence before they were printed, and the more famous writer, who may here pose as the humbler one *poetica licentia*, may have been unaware that Griffin was his debtor [i.e., through the plagiarizing of passages from the *V. & A.* This notion is based further on the fact that Griffin was a Warwickshire man, and that there is some possibility that he had been more successful than Sh. in "ingratiating himself with a common lady friend at a distance from London, yet at one accessible on horseback."] (*Sh., Himself and his Work*, pp. 254–55.)

81

Or I shall liue your Epitaph to make,
Or you suruiue when I in earth am rotten,
From hence your memory death cannot take,
Although in me each part will be forgotten.
Your name from hence immortall life shall haue,
Though I (once gone) to all the world must dye,
The earth can yeeld me but a common graue,
When you intombed in mens eyes shall lye,
Your monument shall be my gentle verse,
Which eyes not yet created shall ore-read,
And toungs to be, your beeing shall rehearse,
When all the breathers of this world are dead,
You still shall liue (such vertue hath my Pen)
Where breath most breaths, euen in the mouths of men.

1. **Or**] *Whe'r* Sta conj.; *Though* Stengel conj. **I shall**] *shall I* G, S, E.
1–2. **make, . . . rotten,**] *make? . . . rotten?* G, S, E.
2. **Or you**] *You will* Stengel conj.
11–12. **rehearse, . . . dead,**] *rehearse. . . . dead,* 1640, G¹; *rehearse: . . . dead,* G²; *rehearse, . . . dead;* S, E, M, A, Kt, Co, B, Del, Hu, Dy, Sta, Cl, Kly, Wh¹, Hal, Cam, Do, Ty, Ox, Her, Be, Bull; *rehearse . . . dead;* Gl, R, Wh², Wy, N, Wa; *rehearse; . . . dead,* Walker conj.
14. **breaths**] *kills* Sta conj. **euen**] *e'en* S¹; *ev'n* S², E.

Massey: [This sonnet] is vacant of meaning where it stands. (p. 173.) Beeching: This sonnet is plainly misplaced; its theme is conventional. [For sources or analogues, see notes on S. 55. — Ed.]

4. **in me each part.** Beeching: Every characteristic of me.
7–10. Tyler: [Cf. Drayton, *Idea*, S. 44:

Ensuing ages yet my rhymes shall cherish
Where I entomb'd my better part shall save.]

(Intro., pp. 40–41.)

12. **breathers.** Malone: Cf. *A. Y. L.*, III, ii, 297: "I will chide no breather in the world but myself." **this world.** Dowden: This age.
13. **Pen.** Wyndham [explains the capitalization here as signifying] the instrument of an art, used as its emblem. [Cf. 84, 5; 106, 7.] (p. 263.) [But in

other passages where the word is used in the same way (32, 6; 78, 3; 85, 8; etc.) it is not capitalized. — ED.]

14. BEECHING: As one who lives is called *par excellence* a "breather," you shall live in the very realm of breath. **in the mouths of men.** LEE: Cf. the Latin phrase (from Ennius): "Volito vivu' per ora virum," to which Sh. had already made allusion in *T.And.*, I, i, 389–90.

MACKAIL: The promise of immortality [here uttered] is too splendid to be insincere; it is no mere flourish of rhetoric, but the authentic and inspired voice of poetry, which sounds in these noble lines. (*Lect. on Poetry*, p. 200.)

G. A. LEIGH [believes this sonnet and a few of the same group to have been addressed to Queen Elizabeth, with reference to an intended poem in her honor. (*Westm. Rev.*, 147: 180.)]

WYNDHAM: The present Countess of Pembroke states (*Pall Mall Mag.*, Oct., 1897) that [lines 9–14 of this sonnet], with "ever" for "even" in line 14, are found written in "17th century character on an old parchment, pasted on the back of a panel bearing a small painting of William, third Earl of Pembroke." LEE: The ink and handwriting are quite modern, and hardly make pretence to be of old date in the eyes of any one accustomed to study manuscripts. On May 5 [1898] some persons interested in the matter, including myself, examined the portrait and the inscription, on the kind invitation of the present Earl, and the inscription was unanimously declared by palæographical experts to be a clumsy forgery unworthy of serious notice. (*Life*, p. 412n.)

82

I GRANT thou wert not married to my Muse,
And therefore maiest without attaint ore-looke
The dedicated words which writers vse
Of their faire subiect, blessing euery booke.
Thou art as faire in knowledge as in hew,
Finding thy worth a limmit past my praise,
And therefore art inforc'd to seeke anew,
Some fresher stampe of the time bettering dayes.
And do so loue, yet when they haue deuisde,
What strained touches Rhethorick can lend,
Thou truly faire, wert truly simpathizde,
In true plaine words, by thy true telling friend.
And their grosse painting might be better vs'd,
Where cheekes need blood, in thee it is abus'd.

7. **art**] *are* G^1, S^1.

8. **time bettering**] Hyphened by G, etc.; *time's bettering* C.

12. **true plaine**] Hyphened by Walker conj., Sta, Dy^2, Hu^2. **true telling**] Hyphened by G^2, S^1, C, M, etc.

---

1. DOWDEN: His friend had perhaps alleged in playful self-justification that he had not married Sh.'s Muse, vowing to forsake all other, and keep only unto her.

2. **attaint.** SCHMIDT: Disgrace. [Cf. 88, 7.] **ore-looke.** SCHMIDT: Peruse. [Cf. *M. N. D.*, II, ii, 121: "I o'erlook Love's stories."]

3. **dedicated words.** SCHMIDT: Dedicatory words. DOWDEN: This may only mean "devoted words," but probably has reference, as the next line seems to show, to the words of some dedication prefixed to a book. [Line 4 surely does not suggest a particular book, but books addressed to patrons generally. — ED.] TYLER: Possibly [a] reference to a dedication either actual or proposed. WYNDHAM: Refers, as I think, to the body of the book — the praises dedicated to their object — and not merely to the prefixed dedication. R. H. LEGIS [(*N. & Q.*, 5th s., 6: 163) finds here an allusion to the dedications of Drayton. His "dedicated words"] will be found at the commencement of the 1st and 3rd songs, hymns, or books, of [the *Polyolbion*]. HENRY BROWN [finds allusions to the dedications of Francis Davison (see his note on S. 78) and John Davies, the latter appearing to be the principal rival poet. See especially his dedication of

Mirum in Modum to Pembroke. (pp. 184–85.)] CREIGHTON [(*Blackwood*, 169: 678) is certain that the reference is to the numerous dedications of Daniel.] LEE: There seems small doubt that Sh. has in mind the dedicatory sonnets and addresses inscribed in 1594 and succeeding years to his own patron, the Earl of Southampton, who was in Nashe's phrase "a dear lover and cherisher" of poets. Among the earl's poetic eulogists were, besides Nashe, Barnabe Barnes, Gervase Markham, John Florio, Samuel Daniel, John Davies, George Chapman, and many others. All these panegyrists of Southampton exhausted in his honour the vocabulary of praise, mainly in sonnets, and one or other of them is doubtless referred to [here.] (Note on S. 78.) [For the style of dedications of the period, cf. Nashe's to Southampton, prefixed to *The Unfortunate Traveler* (1594):] "Incomprehensible is the height of your spirit both in heroical resolution and matters of conceit. Unreprievebly perisheth that booke whatsoever to wast paper, which on the diamond rocke of your judgement disasterly chanceth to be shipwrackt." Elsewhere Nashe calls Southampton "the matchless image of honour and magnificent rewarder of vertue, Jove's eagle-borne Ganimede." [See many further specimens in *Life of Sh.*, pp. 384–89.] H. D. GRAY [thinks this passage to be evidence that Sonnets 82–83] could not have been written to Southampton, who had twice received Sh.'s "dedicated words." (*Pub. M. L. A.*, n.s. 23: 636n.)

4. **blessing every booke.** A. HALL: In Drayton's *Heroical Epistles* . . . we have 11 books and 11 inscriptions, viz., to the Lady Harrington, Earl and Countess of Bedford, Sir Henry and Lady Goodeve, etc., one blessing to each division of one work. Then Chapman, who published his translation of the *Iliad* in detachments, dedicated the first section to Lord Essex, and afterwards, in reprinting it with additions, inscribed it to Prince Henry of Wales, the elder brother of Charles I, and thereto we find appended verses to the Duke of Lennox, the Lord Chancellor, Lords Salisbury, Sussex, etc., including, of course, Lord Southampton. There are 16 in all of these "blessings." (*N. & Q.*, 6th s., 10: 102.)

5. DOWDEN: Sh. had celebrated his friend's beauty (hue); perhaps his learned rival had celebrated the patron's knowledge. TYLER: Subsequently, in the title to a sonnet accompanying his translation of the *Iliad*, Chapman addressed Pembroke as "the Learned and Most Noble Patron of Learning," and the sonnet celebrates Pembroke's "god-like learning."

6. WALSH: Cf. 103, 7. Lee: [Cf. Campion's lines to Lord Walden, in which he professed that] "the admired virtues" of the patron's youth

> Bred such despairing to his daunted Muse
> That it could scarcely utter naked truth. (*Life*, p. 140.)

8. BEECHING: [This line may imply] that the rival poet is a younger man than Sh. (Intro., p. xliv.) **time bettering.** VERITY: Cf. 32, 10, and *Per.*, I, Prol., 11–12: "These latter times, when wit's more ripe."

10. **strained.** Cf. "stretched," 17, 12.

11. **simpathizde.** SCHMIDT: Answered to. [Cf. *Lucrece*, 1113:

> True sorrow then is feelingly sufficed
> When with like semblance it is sympathized.]

My plain words were most suitable to, expressed best, thy fair nature.

13–14. Cf. WYNDHAM'S note on 67, 5–6.

83

I NEVER saw that you did painting need,
And therefore to your faire no painting set,
I found (or thought I found) you did exceed,
The barren tender of a Poets debt:
And therefore haue I slept in your report,
That you your selfe being extant well might show,
How farre a moderne quill doth come to short,
Speaking of worth, what worth in you doth grow,
This silence for my sinne you did impute,
Which shall be most my glory being dombe,
For I impaire not beautie being mute,
When others would giue life, and bring a tombe.
There liues more life in one of your faire eyes,
Then both your Poets can in praise deuise.

2. **your**] *you* S, E. **faire**] *face* G^2.
7. **to**] *too* G, etc.
8. **what**] *that* M conj.
9. **for**] *of* 1640, G, S, E.
10. **being**] *thinking* or *praising* Sta conj.
13. **There**] *Their* L, M [not Bo].

1–2. **painting.** WYNDHAM: High-flown poetical praise. Cf. 85, 3–4. HORACE DAVIS: Cf. 101, 6–7.

2. **faire.** See note on 16, 11.

4. **tender.** SCHMIDT: A thing offered. [Cf. *Haml.*, I, iii, 106: "You have ta'en his tenders for true pay."]

5. MALONE: I have not sounded your praises.

7. **moderne.** MALONE: Common or trite. [So SCHMIDT, DOWDEN, BEECHING, LEE, PORTER, etc.] TYLER: The pen, most probably, of the rival poet, the "fresher stamp" . . . of 82, 8. To take "modern" in the sense of "trivial" seems to me unsatisfactory. WYNDHAM: The ordinary sense is intended. In

the Sonnets the poet constantly contrasts modernity unfavourably with antiquity. Cf. 59, 7; 68, 9; 106, 7–8; 108, 12. [The prevalent interpretation of the word is based on the general Shakespearean usage, and is probably sound. The analogy of the thought in S. 106 (especially the conclusion), however, is an attractive one for Wyndham's interpretation, which, of course, is not opposed to Elizabethan usage. Cf. Jonson, *Volpone*, III, iv: "He has so modern and facile a vein, fitting the time." (*N. E. D.*) — Ed.]

8. **what worth.** [With this elliptical construction, cf. *Haml.*, I, i, 31–33:

> Let us once again assail your ears,
> That are so fortified against our story,
> What we two nights have seen.

Of this passage Abbott observes (§ 252) that "what" depends on a verb of speech, implied either in "assail your ears" or in "story." So one may say that a verb of speech is implied in "come too short"; or, that the verb "speaking" is made to carry its effect over into the following clause. Tyler avoids the difficulty by placing a dash, instead of a comma, after "worth," and an exclamation point after "grow." — Ed.] **doth grow.** Schmidt: Is. [Cf. 84, 4; 93, 13.] Tyler: This word may possibly mean "doth grow as a poet contemplates and attempts to describe your worth," or the word may allude to Mr. W. H.'s still immature youth.

10. **being.** [On the use of the participle without a formal subject, see Abbott, § 378.]

11–12. Von Mauntz: Cf. Ovid, *Tristia*, II, 337–38:

> Et tamen ausus eram: sed detrectare videbar,
> Quodque nefas, damno viribus esse tuis.

12. Malone: When others endeavour to celebrate your character, while, in fact, they disgrace it by the meanness of their compositions. Dowden: Cf. 17, 3–4.

13–14. Lee: Of Southampton's poetic protégés, Barnes makes the most marked reference to the noble patron's "fair eyes"; see his sonnet (dedicatory to *Parthenophil*, 1593): "Gracious eyes, those heavenly lamps which give the Muses light," etc.

14. **both your Poets.** Isaac [finds evidence here that there were two rivals in mind:] Sh. cannot be understood to be one of them, for in this same sonnet he tells that he has been a long while silent, and in another that his ability is inadequate. [The same thing, he believes, is indicated by the fact that in certain sonnets (Isaac says 79–86, perhaps an error for 80 and 86) Sh. seems to speak of a rival who stands higher than himself, but in 82–84 of one on whom he looks down. The former Isaac conjectures to be Spenser, the latter Marlowe.] (*Jahrb.*, 19: 236, 241.) [Wyndham appears to understand "both your poets" in the same way:] Among these others who still sing, while the poet is himself silent, two are conspicuous. (Intro., p. cxvii). [Surely most readers understand "both your poets" to be the speaker and his rival. The fact that

he is silent is quite beside the question: speech is vain, he says, because your worth is such that if both of us devoted ourselves to a single feature we should find it beyond our reach. — ED.]

Mrs. STOPES [compares with this sonnet a passage from William Hunnis, in the *Paradise of Dainty Devices:*]

> With painted speache I list not prove my cunning for to trie,
> Nor yet will use to fill my penne with gileful flatterie;
> With pen in hand, and hart in brest, shall faithful promise make
> To love you best, and serve you most, by your great vertues sake.

SAMUEL NEIL [(*Life of Sh.*, p. 107) believes that this and the following three sonnets were addressed to Queen Elizabeth.]

84

WHO is it that sayes most, which can say more,
Then this rich praise, that you alone, are you,
In whose confine immured is the store,
Which should example where your equall grew,
Leane penurie within that Pen doth dwell,
That to his subiect lends not some small glory,
But he that writes of you, if he can tell,
That you are you, so dignifies his story.
Let him but coppy what in you is writ,
Not making worse what nature made so cleere,
And such a counter-part shall fame his wit,
Making his stile admired euery where.
You to your beautious blessings adde a curse,
Being fond on praise, which makes your praises worse.

1. **most,**] *most?* M, etc. (except Tu).
2. **are you,**] *art you*, 1640; *are you?* G, etc.; *are you:* C.
4. **grew,**] *grew?* C, Sta, Kly, But, Wa.
8. **story.**] *story*, L, M, A, Kt, Co^{1}, B, Del, Dy^{1}, Cl, Gl, Kly, Hal, Cam^{1}, Do, Wh^{2}, Ox; *story:* C, Hu, Co^{2,3}, Dy^{2}, Bull; *story;* Wh^{1}, Her, Be.
10. **worse**] *gross* Sta conj., But.
11. **wit**] *writ* 1640.
12. **his stile**] *his still* 1640; *him still* G, S, E.
13. **blessings**] *blessing* G, S, E.
14. **on**] *of* G^{2}, S, E. **praise,**] *praise* Ty.

1. **Who is it.** DOWDEN: Which of us, the rival poet or I? TYLER: Which of the two, the describer or the eulogist? **which.** PERCY SIMPSON: A relative pronoun; but it has been frequently read as interrogative, and the line distorted to "Who is it that says most?" etc. (*Sh. Punctuation*, p. 13.) [This reading of the line had been anticipated by STAUNTON, and independently by the late Professor A. G. NEWCOMER, who explained it: "Who is it — be it even he that says most — who can say more" etc.]

2. HENRY BROWN: Cf. *A. & C.*, III, ii, 13: "Would you praise Cæsar, say 'Cæsar,' go no further." PORTER: Cf. Browning: "What is she? Her human self, — no lower word will serve."

3. **store.** WYNDHAM: The whole wealth of Beauty . . . is enclosed in you.

4. **grew.** [See the textual notes for the punctuation. The great majority of editors of course take "whose" (line 3) as relative, not interrogative. — ED.]

5. **Pen.** See note on 81, 13.

8. **story.** STAUNTON: Not satisfied with copying the mistakes of the Quarto . . . the latest editions of Sh.'s works make confusion worse confounded by terminating the 8th line with a comma instead of a full stop. (*Ath.*, Jan. 31, 1874, p. 161.) [DOWDEN's note, to the effect that Staunton *may* be right, shows that he, at least, followed Malone's punctuation consciously; but it does not appear how he would explain the construction of the sentence.]

9. KRAUSS: Cf. Sidney, *A. & S.*, S. 3:

> In Stella's face I read
> What love and beauty be; then all my deed.
> But copying is what in her Nature writes.
>
> (*Jahrb.*, 16: 176.)

10. **cleere.** SCHMIDT: Beautiful, glorious. TYLER: Manifest, and of such shining beauty.

13. **curse.** BEECHING: Antithesis to "blessings," and so a not much stronger word than "disadvantage"; perhaps "misfortune" comes nearest in modern English. Cf. *W.T.*, II, iii, 86: "It is a curse he cannot be compelled to."

14. STEEVENS: Being fond of such panegyric as debases what is praise-worthy in you, instead of exalting it. [It would seem from this that Steevens should prefer the omission of the comma after "praise." On the other hand, TYLER explains the latter part of the line as meaning, "By which . . . the praise due to you is really lessened and deteriorated," yet omits the comma.] **fond on.** MALONE: Used by Sh. for "fond of." ROLFE: Doting on.

85

My toung-tide Muse in manners holds her still,
While comments of your praise richly compil'd,
Reserue their Character with goulden quill,
And precious phrase by all the Muses fil'd.
I thinke good thoughts, whilst other write good wordes,
And like vnlettered clarke still crie Amen,
To euery Himne that able spirit affords,
In polisht forme of well refined pen.
Hearing you praisd, I say 'tis so, 'tis true,
And to the most of praise adde some-thing more,
But that is in my thought, whose loue to you
(Though words come hind-most) holds his ranke before,
Then others, for the breath of words respect,
Me for my dombe thoughts, speaking in effect.

3. **Reserue their**] *Preserve their* G^2, Burgon conj. (MS.); *Rehearse thy* anon. conj., Ty; *Rehearse your* anon. conj.; *Reserve your* anon. conj.; *Deserve their* Do conj., Ox; *Rehearse their* or *Receive their* Her conj.; *Reserve thy* But; *Rescribe their* Mackail conj.; *Record thy* Bull conj.

4. **fil'd**] *fill'd* G, S, E.

5. **whilst**] *while* A, B, Hu^1, Cl, Kly, Ty, Ox. **other**] *others* G^2, S, E, M, A, Kt, B, Hu^1, Del, Sta, Cl, Kly, Ty, Ox.

6. **Amen**] Italics by M, A, Kly, Co^3, Hu^2; quoted by Kt, $Co^{1,2}$, B, Hu^1, Del, Dy, Sta, Cl, Gl, Wh, Hal, Cam, Do, R, etc.

7. **Himne**] *line* Massey conj.

9. **'tis so, 'tis true**] Italics by M, A, Kly, Co^3, Hu^2; quoted by Kt, $Co^{1,2}$, Hu^1, Del, Dy, Sta, Cl, Gl, Wh, Hal, Cam, Do, R, etc.; "*'tis so*," "*'tis true*," Be.

14. **Me**] *Men* E.

1–4. LEE: The numbing effect of a patron's eminent virtues on a modest poet is a common conceit among Elizabethan poets. Cf. Campion to Lord Walden, [quoted under 82, 6 above.]

2. **compil'd.** See note on 78, 9.

3. **Reserve their Character.** MALONE: "Reserve" has here the sense of "preserve." Cf. 32, 7. DOWDEN: Possibly "Deserve their character" may be right, i.e., "deserve to be written." [SCHMIDT and ROLFE say that the text is probably corrupt.] TYLER [accepting the emendation "Rehearse thy," says

that "character" must be taken] to denote "face, appearance." Cf. *T.N.*, I, ii, 51: "This thy fair and outward character." WYNDHAM: Preserve or treasure up their style by labouring it preciously, with a secondary suggestion of fastidious restraint. . . . That "character" = "style" is confirmed by its being printed with a capital. LEE: Perpetuate the handwriting by executing it with a golden quill. BEECHING: The sense required from this obscure line is an antithesis to line 1, the antithesis expressed quite clearly in line 5. This third line, therefore, must mean "are written down with golden quill." "Character" means "writing," as in 59, 8; for "reserve," therefore, we should expect "receive"; and for that "reserve" may be a misreading of the MS., or it may be used as a strong way of saying "are written in a permanent form for posterity." BULLEN: It is difficult to find any meaning in the ordinary reading. . . . If we regard "their" as a misprint for "thy" we must change "Reserve" to some such word as "Rehearse" or "Record." PORTER: The special meaning attaching to "Reserve" here agrees with that suggested in note on 32, 7 as the sense there. . . . "Character" stands both in the usual meaning, literally, for "handwriting," and, metaphorically, for sedulously careful handwriting, that is, style. [BUTLER'S reading is erroneously stated to be based on Malone. The "you" and "your" of the rest of the sonnet are of course against it. His statement that the Q spelling is "Reserne" is due to a badly outlined "u" which resembles an "n" in the British Museum quarto from which the Praetorius facsimile was made. — ED.]

4. **fil'd.** SCHMIDT: Polished, refined.

5. **other.** See note on 62, 8.

6. ROLFE: Since the clerk, whether lettered or unlettered, responds "Amen," the word ["unletter'd"] must have some special significance. The meaning may be that he endorses the eulogies with as little hesitation as the clerk does the Latin to which he cries "Amen," though he may not understand it. [The word is, of course, sufficiently explained by the attitude which the poet assumes in this whole group of sonnets. Cf. 78, 6, 14. — ED.]

7. **Himne.** LEE [refers to this phrase in his argument for Barnes as the rival poet:] Very few poets of the day in England followed Ronsard's practice of bestowing the title of hymn on miscellaneous poems, but Barnes twice applies the word to his poems of love (*Parthenophil*, Madr. 1, 12; S. 17, 9). (*Life*, p. 134.) [It is not often that a commentator provides us with a refutation of his own position so promptly as does Lee, within two pages of the passage just quoted:] The strongest point in favour of Chapman's identity with the rival poet lies in the fact that each of the two sections of his poem *The Shadow of Night* (1594) is styled a "hymn." . . . But Drayton, of his *Harmonie of the Church* (1591), and Barnes, as we have just seen, both wrote "hymns," and the word was often loosely used in Elizabethan English, as in 16th century French, in the general sense of "poem." (p. 136n.) [In fact, the word as here used is sufficiently explained by the image of the clerk in the church service, without reference to any contemporary poet whatsoever. — ED.] **able spirit.** BEECHING: The "better spirit" of 80, 2.

13–14. McClumpha: Cf. *R. & J.*, II, vi, 30–31:

> Conceit, more rich in matter than in words,
> Brags of his substance, not of ornament.

(*Jahrb.*, 40: 201.)

14. **in effect.** Tyler: In thought and purpose. Cf. S. 23. Beeching: For the contrast of "word" and "effect," cf. *T. of A.*, III, v, 97: "'T is in few words, but spacious in effect."

86

Was it the proud full saile of his great verse,
Bound for the prize of (all to precious) you,
That did my ripe thoughts in my braine inhearce,
Making their tombe the wombe wherein they grew?
Was it his spirit, by spirits taught to write,
Aboue a mortall pitch, that struck me dead?
No, neither he, nor his compiers by night
Giuing him ayde, my verse astonished.
He nor that affable familiar ghost
Which nightly gulls him with intelligence,
As victors of my silence cannot boast,
I was not sick of any feare from thence.
But when your countinance fild vp his line,
Then lackt I matter, that infeebled mine.

1. **proud full**] *proudfull* S¹.

2. **(all to precious)**] (*all too precious*) G¹, S¹; (*all-too-precious*) G², S², E, Wy, Wa; *all-too-precious* C, M, A, Kt, B, Del, Hu, Dy, Sta, Cl, Kly, Ty, Be, Bull; *all too precious* Co, Gl, Wh, Hal, Cam, Do, R, Ox, But, Her, N; *all to precious* Godwin conj.

3. **inhearce**] *rehearse* G, S, E.

9. **affable familiar**] Hyphened by Sta.

11. **victors**] *victors*, G², S², E, M, A, Kt, B, Dy, Sta, Cl, Kly, Cam, Do, Hu², Ty, But, Bull.

13. **fild**] *fill'd* G, S, E, Co, Hu, Gl, Kly, Cam, Do, R, Wh², Ox, Wy, Her, etc.; *fil'd* M, A, Kt, B, Del, Dy, Sta, Cl, Wh¹, Hal, Ty, But.

---

1. Furnivall: [This line] probably alludes to the swelling hexameters of Chapman's Englishing of Homer. (Intro., p. lxv.) **Was.** Massey [takes the past tense, as compared with the present tense of the preceding sonnets, to be

due to the occurrence of Marlowe's death in the mean time. On the other hand, the present of line 10 is explained as an allusion to the play of *Faustus*, still running on the stage. (p. 168.)] **full saile.** FLEAY [finds here an allusion to Nash's *Pierce Penniless*, where Southampton may be represented under the pseudonym Amyntas, and where the expression "full sail" is used. In the same connection he offers some very dubious evidence connecting lines 9–10 with the same book. (*Macm. Mag.*, 31: 439.)]

2. **(all to precious).** GODWIN: May the line not have read originally, "Bound to the prize of all," that is, to the common prize of all writers, . . . to precious you? (p. 196.) PERCY SIMPSON: Compound nouns or adjectives [were regularly] enclosed within brackets where we should employ the hyphen if we used any punctuation at all. Cf. *2 H. 4* [Folio], II, i, 123: "Such (more then impudent) sawcines."

4. MALONE: Cf. *R. & J.*, II, iii, 9–10:

> The earth, that's nature's mother, is her tomb;
> What is her burying grave, that is her womb.

ROLFE: We find the same thought in Lucretius, v. 259: "Omniparens eadem rerum commune sepulchrum." WALSH: Cf. ["To Time," by "A. W.," in Davison's *Poetical Rhapsody*:] "Thy womb, that all doth breed, is tomb to all." VERITY: Cf. Spenser, *Ruins of Time:*

> The seeds of which all things at first were bred
> Shall in great Chaos' womb again be hid.

5. **spirit . . . spirits.** [See ABBOTT's note on 52, 14. Here again, however, we need only to note that "spirit" was regularly either monosyllabic or dissyllabic. Cf. 56, 8 with 61, 5. — ED.] MASSEY [finds here the chief evidence of Marlowe as rival poet:] Sh. speaks of Marlowe and identifies him with the "familiar" spirit, Mephistopheles, just as Thorpe does when he dedicates the translation of Lucan's first book to Edward Blunt, and alludes to Marlowe as a "familiar spirit." [Marlowe was generally believed to practice necromancy as a student of black magic. Sh.] grants the facts of Marlowe's writing under what is now termed "spirit-control," . . . but says [line 12] it was not this that cowed or overcrowed him, and made him keep silence. (pp. 164, 170.)

7. **compiers by night.** R. H. LEGIS [taking Drayton as rival poet (see his note on 82, 3), views these compeers as Sir Robert Aston and the other friends who aided Drayton in writing the *Polyolbion*. (*N. & Q.*, 5th s., 6: 163.)]

8. **astonished.** SCHMIDT: Stunned with fear. [Cf. *Lucrece*, 1730: "Stone-still, astonish'd with this deadly deed."]

9–10. STEEVENS: Alluding perhaps to the celebrated Dr. Dee's pretended intercourse with an angel, and other familiar spirits. MASSEY: Who does not recognize Faustus, his necromancy, and his boasts of what he will have the spirits do for him? Who does not see that Sh., thinking dramatically, has identified Marlowe with Faustus and thrown him on the stage, where, in vision — if it be not an actual fact that the play was running at the Curtain Theatre while Sh. was composing that sonnet — he sees his familiar Mephistopheles

"gulling him nightly" with such intelligence as that "in Hell are all manner of delights." [Cf. especially the line in *Dr. Faustus*, "They say thou hast a familiar spirit," etc.] (*Qu. Rev.*, 115: 447.) HENRY BROWN, [taking Davies as rival poet, thinks Drayton may have been the] intelligencer alluded to, as aiding Davies, like an evil spirit, with dark suggestions. (p. 193.) DELIUS [thinks that the assistant who was referred to in line 7 is here] ironically called an obliging house-spirit. A. HALL: If Marlowe or one of his well-known contemporaries were the better spirit of S. 80, the able spirit of 85, the writer of the great verse in 86, then Peele, Nash, Lodge, Drayton, Chapman, Ric. Barnfield, Barnaby Rich, and such like being the compeers, the lately deceased Robert Greene would be the affable familiar ghost who was reproduced from the spirit world over and over again as stepfather to numerous pamphlets, freely manufactured by some of these so-called "compeers" but disavowed by all. (*N. & Q.*, 6th s., 10: 102.) [Later, however (*ibid.*, p. 182), Hall takes the view that the "better spirit" is a burlesque term, and (following Fleay) that Nash is ironically referred to. On MINTO's interpretation of the passage in connection with Chapman, see Appendix, p. 475.]

13. **countinance.** SCHMIDT: Authority, patronage. [Cf. *1 H. 4*, I, ii, 33: "Under whose countenance we steal."] MASSEY [thinks that the reference is to Southampton's countenance given to the finishing of Marlowe's *Hero & Leander*. (p. 167.)] **fild.** STEEVENS [with Malone's reading "fil'd":] Polished. Cf. Jonson's Verses on Sh.: "In his well-torned and true-filed lines." COLLIER: The word is spelt "fild" (as "fill'd" was usually spelt), and not "fil'd" (as in S. 85) in the Quarto; and . . . the preposition "up" shows that what the poet meant was "fill'd up" or *occupied*. DYCE: Mr. Collier's remark about "up" carries no weight; for even if we choose to consider that preposition as redundant here . . . its redundancy is unobjectionable according to the phraseology of Sh. and his contemporaries. [A writer signing himself "JABEZ" (*N. & Q.*, 5th s., 7: 283) observes that in the Q "filled" is always spelt "fild," and "filed" "fil'd." (See 63, 3; to which may be added 17, 2; for "fil'd" the "always" of Jabez's statement must depend on 85, 4. — ED.) He adds that "the sense . . . ought to have saved Dyce and others from the blunder of printing 'fil'd.'" R. H. LEGIS retorts (*ibid.*, p. 385) that "enfeebled," not "lacked," is the true antithesis of the word in dispute; read, therefore, "polished up or made powerful." To whom "Jabez" (p. 465), to the effect that "filed" does not and never did mean "made powerful."] DOWDEN: "Fill'd up his line" is opposed to "then lack'd I matter."

14. **lackt I matter.** TYLER: Cf. *T. & C.*, II, iii, 103: "Then will Ajax lack matter, if he have lost his argument."

G. STRONACH, [(*N. & Q.*, 9th s., 12: 141) taking the sonnet series to be a miscellany like the *Pass. Pilgrim*, believes that this sonnet was written *about* Sh. by Barnes.]

COLERIDGE [notes this sonnet as an example of] Sh.'s readiness to praise his rivals, *ore pleno*, and the confidence of his own equality with those whom he deemed most worthy of his praise. (*Biog. Lit.*, chap. 2.)

87

FAREWELL thou art too deare for my possessing,
And like enough thou knowst thy estimate,
The Charter of thy worth giues thee releasing:
My bonds in thee are all determinate.
For how do I hold thee but by thy granting,
And for that ritches where is my deseruing?
The cause of this faire guift in me is wanting,
And so my pattent back againe is sweruing.
Thy selfe thou gau'st, thy owne worth then not knowing,
Or mee to whom thou gau'st it, else mistaking,
So thy great guift vpon misprision growing,
Comes home againe, on better iudgement making.
Thus haue I had thee as a dreame doth flatter,
In sleepe a King, but waking no such matter.

5. **granting,**] *granting?* C, M, etc.
6. **that**] *those* G².
8. **pattent**] *patient* Bo conj.

TYLER: This "farewell" is probably intended, like Ophelia's return of Hamlet's "remembrances," to evoke a renewed avowal of affection. WYNDHAM: [In the group 87–96] the spirit of the verse suddenly changes: the music becomes plangent, and the theme of utter estrangement is handled with a complete command over dramatic yet sweetly modulated discourse. The group is, indeed, a single speech of tragic intensity. (Intro., p. cxii.) WALSH: The first and last lines sound as if addressed to a woman, the intervening as if to a man; which recalls to mind the "master-mistress" of S. 20. . . . But we know of no final falling out with the friend (except in Mr. Butler's interpretation of 125). Still, this may express only a temporary mood, and so might come after 36 (or even after 58.) In the Quarto it is placed as if addressed to the patron after the incident of the rival poet, — also a possibility.

1. FLEAY: Cf. Drayton, S. 61:

> Since there's no help, come, let us kiss and part! . . .
> Shake hands for ever! Cancel all our vows! [etc.]

3. **Charter.** [Reproduced as "Cha ter" in the First Folio Edition, the "r" being wholly or partially obscured in some copies, though plain in the Bodleian copy from which the Clarendon Press reprint is made. For the word, cf. 58, 9. — ED.]

3–4. LEE: Cf. Barnes, *P. & P.*, S. 15: "I shall resign thy love's large charter and thy bonds again."

4. **determinate.** MALONE: Ended, out of date. The term is used in legal conveyances. SCHMIDT: Limited. ROLFE: Cf. "determination," 13, 6. [Modern editors generally cite Malone's definition with approval, doubtless understanding "bonds in thee" to mean "bonds giving me a claim upon thee." Schmidt may have taken "in thee" as belonging with "determinate." — ED.]

6. **that ritches.** SCHMIDT: [Often used as a singular noun.]

7–8. Cf. 49, 13–14.

8. **pattent.** SCHMIDT: Privilege.

11. **upon misprision growing.** TYLER: Upon its becoming clear that you had made a mistake. BEECHING: Arising from an oversight.

13. DOWDEN: Cf. *R. & J.*, V, i, 1: "If I may trust the flattering truth of sleep." MCCLUMPHA: Cf. *R. & J.*, II, ii, 141: "A dream too flattering-sweet."

DOWDEN: This sonnet in form is distinguished by double rhymes throughout. [Except lines 2 and 4, as noted by ROLFE. Professor G. H. PALMER speaks of "the flutterings of the heart conveyed" in these double rhymes. (p. 9.) LEE notes similar repeated participial endings in Daniel, *Sonnets after Astrophel*, 24, and Watson's *Tears of Fancy*, 28.]

88

WHEN thou shalt be dispode to set me light,
And place my merrit in the eie of skorne,
Vpon thy side, against my selfe ile fight,
And proue thee virtuous, though thou art forsworne:
With mine owne weakenesse being best acquainted,
Vpon thy part I can set downe a story
Of faults conceald, wherein I am attainted:
That thou in loosing me, shall win much glory:
And I by this wil be a gainer too,
For bending all my louing thoughts on thee,
The iniuries that to my selfe I doe,
Doing thee vantage, duble vantage me.
  Such is my loue, to thee I so belong,
  That for thy right, my selfe will beare all wrong.

1. **dispode**] *disposde* L; *dispos'd* 1640, G, etc.
3. **my**] *thy* 1640, G, S, E.
8. **loosing**] *losing* G^2, etc. **shall**] *shalt* S, M, etc. (except Wh^2, N).
12. **duble vantage**] Hyphened by C, M, etc. (except Co, Hal, Wh^1).

[WALSH puts this sonnet next to 49. See note on 49, 11–12.]

1. **set me light.** DOWDEN: Esteem me little.

2. MALONE: Cf. *Oth.*, IV, ii, 54:

> The fixed figure for the time of scorn
> To point his slow and moving finger at.

7. **attainted.** See 82, 2.

12. TYLER: Whatever satisfaction his friend may find in setting forth his faults, this satisfaction will be doubled to himself.

ISAAC [believes that this and the two following sonnets belong with 139–140, addressed to the dark woman. Line 4, in particular, must relate to a woman and to her of S. 152. He notes also that the thought is repeated in S. 149. (*Archiv*, 62: 22–23.) See, to similar effect, WALSH'S note on S. 89.]

89

SAY that thou didst forsake mee for some falt,
And I will comment vpon that offence,
Speake of my lamenesse, and I straight will halt:
Against thy reasons making no defence.
Thou canst not (loue) disgrace me halfe so ill,
To set a forme vpon desired change,
As ile my selfe disgrace, knowing thy wil,
I will acquaintance strangle and looke strange:
Be absent from thy walkes and in my tongue,
Thy sweet beloued name no more shall dwell,
Least I (too much prophane) should do it wronge:
And haplie of our old acquaintance tell.
For thee, against my selfe ile vow debate,
For I must nere loue him whom thou dost hate.

7. **disgrace,**] *disgrace;* G, S, E, Cam, Do, But, Her, Ox, Be, R²; *disgrace:* M, A, Kt, Co, B, Del, Hu, Dy, Sta, Cl, Gl, Kly, Wh, Hal, R¹, Ty, Wy, N, Bull, Wa.

9. **in**] *on* G², S², E.

10. **sweet beloued**] Hyphened by M, A, Kt, B, Del, Dy, Sta, Cl, Kly, Hu².

---

2. **comment.** ROLFE: Expatiate. BEECHING: Moralize. So of Jaques (*A. Y. L.*, II, i, 65), "weeping and commenting upon the sobbing dear," it was asked, "Did he not moralize this spectacle?" [I fail to see what proof this furnishes that the word "comment" means "moralize." — ED.]

3. **lamenesse.** [See notes on 37, 3. In addition to the comments there cited, one may note a defence of the literal interpretation by "Speriend" (*N. & Q.*, 5th s., 3: 134, 497), who states that the notion of Sh.'s lameness was given currency by Waldron in his edition of Jonson's *Sad Shepherd*.] C. A. BROWN: Had he really been lame this would have lost its point, and the promise of "making no defence" would have been ridiculous. (p. 81.) CARTWRIGHT: The author means, Speak of my reputation as a player, and straight I will acknowledge it, as just cause for your forsaking me. (p. 34.)

5–8. ISAAC: [Cf. Daniel, S. 27:

> I'll tell the world that I deserv'd but ill,
> And blame myself, for to excuse thy heart.]

(*Jahrb.*, 17: 174.)

6. DOWDEN: Give a becoming appearance to the change which you desire. Cf. *M. N. D.*, I, i, 232–33:

> Things base and vile, holding no quantity,
> Love can transpose to form and dignity.

[So SCHMIDT, who renders "form" as "good semblance." BEECHING says "pretext."]

8. **acquaintance strangle.** MALONE: Put an end to our familiarity. Cf. *T.N.*, V, i, 150: "That makes thee strangle thy propriety;" . . . *A. & C.*, II, vi, 130: "You shall find the band that seems to tie their friendship together will be the very strangler of their amity." BEECHING: [The metaphor also occurs in *W.T.*, IV, iv, 47; *H. 8*, V, i, 157; *T. & C.*, IV, iv, 39.] **looke strange.** FLEAY: Cf. Drayton, S. 61:

> When we meet at any time again
> Be it not seen in either of our brows
> That we one jot of former love retain.

(*Biog. Chron.*, 2: 230.)

8–12. Cf. 36, 9–12.

13. **debate.** SCHMIDT: Contest. [Cf. *2 H. 4*, IV, iv, 2: "This debate that bleedeth at our doors."]

WALSH: Compare this and the preceding sonnet . . . with 149, which is admitted to be addressed to a woman.

90

THEN hate me when thou wilt, if euer, now,
Now while the world is bent my deeds to crosse,
Ioyne with the spight of fortune, make me bow.
And doe not drop in for an after losse:
Ah doe not, when my heart hath scapte this sorrow,
Come in the rereward of a conquerd woe,
Giue not a windy night a rainie morrow,
To linger out a purposd ouer-throw.
If thou wilt leaue me, do not leaue me last,
When other pettie griefes haue done their spight,
But in the onset come, so stall I taste
At first the very worst of fortunes might.
And other straines of woe, which now seeme woe,
Compar'd with losse of thee, will not seeme so.

4. **after losse**] Hyphened by S¹, C, M, etc. (except Co, Wh¹, Hal).
6. **woe**] *foe* Palgrave conj.
11. **stall**] *shall* 1640, etc.

2–3. BEECHING: Does this "spite of fortune" refer to the troubles of Sh.'s company, due to the popularity of the boy actors? See *Haml.*, II, ii, 352. J. M.: [Line 2] we believe refers to the growing puritanism, which called for the prohibition of stage plays. On July 28, 1597, the Privy Council issued an order that the theatres were to be "plucked down." The "spite of fortune," "loss," and "sorrow," we believe refer to the death of his only son, Hamnet, . . . August, 1596. (p. 226.) [The comma after "crosse"] should be substituted by a semicolon as at the end of line 1. By retaining the comma . . . it is made to appear that the "bent of the world," which crossed his deeds, and the "spite of fortune," which was a "sorrow of the heart" and a "loss," were one and the same. . . . The expressions refer to two distinct matters, as is further proved by the use of the plural further on in the sonnet — "petty griefs" and "strains of woe." (p. 69.)

4. **drop in.** SCHMIDT: Come in. [The only occurrence of the phrase noted in the *N. E. D.* for the Elizabethan period. — ED.]

5. GERVINUS, [like "J. M.," refers "this sorrow" to the death of the poet's son. ISAAC denies this (*Archiv*, 62: 25), as contradicted by the "petty griefs" of line 10.] BUTLER: I incline to think that these lines refer to the subject of Sonnets 33–34, and not to the "spite of fortune" mentioned in line 3.

6. STEEVENS: Cf. *R. & J.*, III, ii, 121: "But with a rear-ward following Tybalt's death, 'Romeo is banished.'"

7. VERITY: Cf. *Lucrece*, 1788: "This windy tempest, till it blow up rain."

11–12. VON MAUNTZ: Cf. Ovid, *Ex Ponto*, II, ii, 31–32:

> Fortuna miserrima tuta est:
> Nam timor eventus deterioris abest.

13. **straines.** SCHMIDT: Motions of the mind, feelings (Germ. *Regung*). [Cf. *Much Ado*, V, i, 12:

> Measure his woe the length and breadth of mine,
> And let it answer every strain for strain.]

TYLER: The expression . . . may be taken as nearly equivalent to "kinds of woe," though there is probably added the idea of extension or lengthening. WYNDHAM: Kinds, with the sense, also, of comparative degrees (O.E. *streen*, i.e., stock, race). Cf. *Cor.*, V, iii, 149: "Thou hast affected the fine strains of honour." . . . The poet, perhaps, plays here, as often, on the identity of this word with the other "strain" (O. Fr. *estraindre* = to strain), suggesting the "strain" imposed by woes on the sufferer. BEECHING: The passage in *Much Ado* . . . seems to fix the meaning of "strain" in both places as "sort," "kind," which connects with the root meaning of "race." **woe . . . woe.** G. H. PALMER [speaks of "the calamitous crash produced by the inner rhyme" here. (p. 9.)]

WYNDHAM: The theme of [this sonnet] is a sorrow which has, I suppose, been suffered, at one time or another, by most men: it is hackneyed as dying. Yet the eloquence is peerless. I doubt if in all recorded speech such faultless perfection may be found, so sustained through fourteen consecutive lines. That perfection does not arise from any thought in the piece itself, for none is abstruse; nor from its sentiment, which is common to all who love, and suffer or fear a diminution in their love's return; nor even from its imagery, though the line, "Give not a windy night a rainy morrow," holds its own against Keats's "There is a budding morrow in midnight," which Rossetti once chose for the best in English poetry. It arises from perfect verbal execution: from diction, rhythm, and the just incidence of accentual stresses enforced by assonance and alliteration. (Intro., p. cxxxix.) SPALDING: An echo of the cry that went out from another agonised breast some 1600 years before: "That thou doest, do quickly." (*Gent. Mag.*, 242: 315.)

91

Some glory in their birth, some in their skill,
Some in their wealth, some in their bodies force,
Some in their garments though new-fangled ill:
Some in their Hawkes and Hounds, some in their Horse.
And euery humor hath his adiunct pleasure,
Wherein it findes a ioy aboue the rest,
But these perticulers are not my measure,
All these I better in one generall best.
Thy loue is bitter then high birth to me,
Richer then wealth, prouder then garments cost,
Of more delight then Hawkes or Horses bee:
And hauing thee, of all mens pride I boast.
Wretched in this alone, that thou maist take,
All this away, and me most wretched make.

2. **bodies**] *body's* C, M, A, Kt, Co, B, Del, Hu[1], Dy[1], Sta, Cl, Kly, Wh[1], Hal, Cam, Do, Ty, Ox, But, Wa; *bodies'* Gl, Dy[2], Hu[2], R, Wh[2], Wy, Her, Be, N, Bull.

4. **Horse**] *horse'* Hu[2].

9. **bitter**] *better* 1640, G, etc.

14. **make.**] *make:* Kly.

---

3. **new-fangled ill.** Rolfe: Fashionable but ugly.

4. **Horse.** Dowden: Probably the plural; . . . cf. *T. of S.*, Ind., 61: "Another tell him of his hounds and horse." Wyndham: The capitals show that all three words are generalised, and that they stand for the establishments and pursuits of Hawking, Hunting, and the Manege.

10. Steevens: Cf. *Cymb.*, III, iii, 23–24:

> Richer than doing nothing for a babe,
> Prouder than rustling in unpaid-for silk.

13–14. Walsh: Contrast this with the ending of 25.

92

BVT doe thy worst to steale thy selfe away,
For tearme of life thou art assured mine,
And life no longer then thy loue will stay,
For it depends vpon that loue of thine.
Then need I not to feare the worst of wrongs,
When in the least of them my life hath end,
I see, a better state to me belongs
Then that, which on thy humor doth depend.
Thou canst not vex me with inconstant minde,
Since that my life on thy reuolt doth lie,
Oh what a happy title do I finde,
Happy to haue thy loue, happy to die!
But whats so blessed faire that feares no blot,
Thou maist be falce, and yet I know it not.

3. **thy**] *my* 1640, G, S, E.
6. **least**] *last* But.
8. **thy**] *my* 1640, G, S, E.
13. **blessed faire**] Hyphened by M, etc. (except Co^{1,2}, Wh^{1}, Hal). **blot,**] *blot?* G, etc.
14. **not.**] *not:* M, A, Kt, B, Del, Dy, Sta, Cl, Kly, Hu^{2}, Ty.

---

6. **least.** BUTLER [defends his emendation by saying:] Surely Sh. cannot consider Mr. W. H.'s leaving him as "the least" of wrongs. It would be the culminating, and hence the last misfortune. TYLER: The pain caused by the loss of the friend's affection is the "least of wrongs" on account of its immediate termination. . . . The "worst of wrongs" [is] the continued misery of living alienated.

10. **on thy revolt doth lie.** DOWDEN: Is dependent on your desertion. [Cf. *Macb.*, V, iv, 12:

> Both more and less have given him the revolt,
> And none serve with him but constrained things
> Whose hearts are absent too.

With this phrasing cf. also S. 93, 4.]

93

So shall I liue, supposing thou art true,
Like a deceiued husband, so loues face,
May still seeme loue to me, though alter'd new:
Thy lookes with me, thy heart in other place.
For their can liue no hatred in thine eye,
Therefore in that I cannot know thy change,
In manies lookes, the falce hearts history
Is writ in moods and frounes and wrinckles strange.
But heauen in thy creation did decree,
That in thy face sweet loue should euer dwell,
What ere thy thoughts, or thy hearts workings be,
Thy lookes should nothing thence, but sweetnesse tell.
How like *Eaues* apple doth thy beauty grow,
If thy sweet vertue answere not thy show.

3. **alter'd new**] Hyphened by Del, Sta, Kly.
5. **their**] *there* G, etc.
11. **What ere**] *What are* L; *Whate'er* G, etc.
12. **should**] *shall* G, S, E.
14. **answere**] *answers* E.

[The opening of this sonnet presents an interesting example of the problem of continuity. DOWDEN observes, not without plausibility, that it "carries on the thought of the last line of 92." WALSH, on the other hand, places it after 140, and it will be noted how apposite seems the opening line in such a connection.— ED.]

2. MALONE: Mr. Oldys observes in one of his manuscripts, that this and the preceding sonnet "seem to have been addressed by Sh. to his beautiful wife on some suspicion of her infidelity." He must have read our author's poems with but little attention; otherwise he would have seen that these, as well as the preceding sonnets, and many of those that follow, are not addressed to a female.

4. WALSH: [This line] clearly connects the sonnet with 139, 6 and 140, 14.

5. **thine eye.** Cf. 104, 2, etc., and TYLER'S note on 1, 5.

7. **manies.** ABBOTT [believes this form may be explained by the old noun "many." Cf. *2 H. 4*, I, iii, 91: "O thou fond many." (§ 87.)]

13. **Eaves apple.** STOPES: Which seemed "good for food, and a thing to be desired to make men wise," but in reality bringing death.

94

THEY that haue powre to hurt, and will doe none,
That doe not do the thing, they most do showe,
Who mouing others, are themselues as stone,
Vnmooued, could, and to temptation slow:
They rightly do inherrit heauens graces,
And husband natures ritches from expence,
They are the Lords and owners of their faces,
Others, but stewards of their excellence:
The sommers flowre is to the sommer sweet,
Though to it selfe, it onely liue and die,
But if that flowre with base infection meete,
The basest weed out-braues his dignity:
For sweetest things turne sowrest by their deedes,
Lillies that fester, smell far worse then weeds.

2. most] *must* G, S, E.
11. base] *foul* Sta conj.
12. basest] *barest* Walker conj.

DOWDEN [thus outlines the thought of this difficult sonnet:] They who can hold their passions in check, who can refuse to wrath its outbreak, who can seem loving yet keep a cool heart, who move passion in others, yet are cold and unmoved themselves — they rightly inherit from heaven large gifts, for they husband them; whereas passionate intemperate natures squander their endowments. Those who can assume this or that semblance as they see reason are the masters and owners of their faces; others have no property in such excellences as they possess, but hold them for the advantage of the prudent self-contained persons. True, these self-contained persons may seem to lack generosity; but then, without making voluntary gifts, they give inevitably, even as the summer's flower is sweet to the summer, though it live and die only to itself. Yet let such an one beware of corruption. WYNDHAM: This sonnet is a limb of the continuous argument embodied in [the group 87–96], and, so read, is not obscure. The friend, as described in the preceding number, has a face of which the beauty is a constant expression of love. . . . But this beauty becomes the type of temptation if it be not a true index of virtue. [In this sonnet] the poet develops the ambiguity of the theme. He first puts the case of those who, with an outward beauty that is the engine of temptation, are themselves cold and not easily tempted. They are the owners and controllers of

their beauty; but, putting the alternative case, those whose beauty not only tempts but also leads them into temptation, are but dispensers of it. As an emblem of the first the poet takes a flower which is sweet to the world around it, although it blossoms and dies to itself, self-contained and unregarding: as an emblem of the second, such a flower if it be infected with a canker. TYLER: Cf. *Haml.*, III, ii, 70–76:

> Thou hast been
> As one, in suffering all, that suffers nothing,
> A man that Fortune's buffets and rewards
> Hath ta'en with equal thanks; and blest are those
> Whose blood and judgement are so well commingled
> That they are not a pipe for Fortune's finger
> To sound what stop she please.

Sh., himself perhaps very sensitive and quickly moved, may have appreciated too highly a different kind of character. As to the corruption of such a character as that here described, cf. the portraiture of Angelo in *M. for M.* STOPES: Sh. hastens to disclaim any implied blame [in the preceding sonnet], through the disassociation of character from appearance. It is rather a virtue to be able to control expression. But such people must not do the evil they may.

[This and the two following sonnets will remind many readers of 69, which WALSH places immediately after them. — ED.]

5–8. BEECHING: It is right that self-possessed people should be intrusted with beauty, because they do not squander it in passion. . . . Beautiful persons who are not self-possessed are declared to have no ownership in their beauty, because it is always being spent by them at the command of Love, Anger, Remorse, and other passions.

6. **expence.** Cf. 30, 8 and 129, 1.

10. **to it selfe.** TYLER: Cf. 54, 11.

14. STEEVENS: This line is likewise found in the anonymous play of *Edward III* (1596). [The following is the context, II, i, 441–53, Brooke's *Sh. Apocrypha*, p. 79:

> That sinne doth ten times agrevate it selfe,
> That is committed in a holie place:
> An evill deed, done by authoritie,
> Is sin and subornation: Decke an Ape
> In tissue, and the beautie of the robe
> Adds but the greater scorne unto the beast.
> A spatious field of reasons could I urge
> Betweene his glorie, daughter, and thy shame:
> That poyson shewes worst in a golden cup;
> Darke night seemes darker by the lightning flash;
> Lillies that fester smel far worse then weeds;
> And every glory that inclynes to sin,
> The shame is treble by the opposite.]

DOWDEN: It should be remembered that several critics assign to Sh. a portion of this play [including the passage in question]. C. F. TUCKER BROOKE: The trend of modern opinion inclines strongly to the negative side. The long list of those who deny the presence in the play of more than, conceivably, a few brief insertions by Sh., includes: Mr. Swinburne, Dr. Furnivall, Saintsbury, Knight, Symonds, G. C. Moore Smith, Ulrici, Delius, Warnke and Proescholdt, H. von Friesen, and Liebau. (*Sh. Apocrypha*, p. xxi.) [Critics disagree as to the significance of this repetition, but the majority think that the prior composition of the line in the sonnet is to be inferred from the fact that here it appears to be an integral part of the poem, whereas in the drama it is superfluous if not irrelevant. This position has been taken by DELIUS (*Jahrb.*, 1: 48), ISAAC (*Jahrb.*, 19: 210), SARRAZIN, (*Sh.'s Lehrjahre*, p. 167), and A. PLATT (*Mod. Lang. Rev.*, 6: 511), with the corollary that the sonnet was written as early as 1595. So also LEE: "A line [from *Edw. III*] reappears in Sh.'s Sonnets. It was contrary to his practice to literally plagiarise himself. The line in the play was doubtless borrowed from a MS. copy of the Sonnets." (*Life*, p. 72.) DOWDEN, on the other hand (Intro., p. 23) thinks it "the more likely supposition" that the sonnet borrowed from the play. BEECHING thinks the point incapable of proof: "A line that embalms a proverb may be expected to occur in more than one context, and no safe conclusion can be drawn as to the priority of one over another. . . . But it needs no argument that the style of the speech in *Edw. III*, if it be Sh.'s, is much earlier than that of this sonnet." Mrs. STOPES believes that the line was first written, for the sonnet, in answer to a passage in *Willobies Avisa*, c. 10:

> Unhappie lillie loves a weed
> That gives no sent, that yields no glee;

and was "repeated" in the play. My friend Professor H. D. GRAY adds a note which at least represents a fresh point of approach: "Has it been noted that the line would be more likely to come back into Sh.'s memory, and be used by him in this sonnet, from his having acted in the play, than from his having written the line? Especially is this true if the line were one that he himself had spoken from the stage. It occurs in II, i, and is spoken by Warwick. If it were indeed true that Sh. played Adam in *A. Y. L.*, and the Ghost in *Hamlet*, Warwick would be an entirely appropriate part for him. *Edw. III* was produced by 1595 and probably before; Sonnets 94–96 are to be placed rather among the later than the earlier ones. There is therefore no likelihood that the play could be indebted to the sonnet." With all this one must compare the similar discussion of a phrase in 142, 6. The only conclusion would seem to be that here, as in every other passage where there is a momentary gleam of hope that the Sonnets furnish a definite piece of internal evidence for the date or circumstances of their composition, the gleam soon vanishes over the margin. — ED.]

REGIS [finds in this concluding couplet a resemblance to a passage in Plato, *Republic*, Bk. 6: "Whatever doth not meet with the proper nourishment, . . .

the more vigorous it is by nature, the more it is defective in the excellencies of its kind"; and also to Dante, *Purg.*, 30: 118–20:

> Ma tanto più maligno e più silvestro
> Si fa il terren col mal seme e non colto,
> Quant' egli ha più del buon vigor terrestro.]

WALSH [remarks that it is] a variation of the old proverb "Corruptio optimi pessima." DOWDEN [compares with the whole sonnet a passage in *T.N.*, III, iv, 401–04:]

> In nature there's no blemish but the mind;
> None can be call'd deform'd but the unkind:
> Virtue is beauty, but the beauteous evil
> Are empty trunks o'erflourish'd by the devil.

95

How sweet and louely dost thou make the shame,
Which like a canker in the fragrant Rose,
Doth spot the beautie of thy budding name?
Oh in what sweets doest thou thy sinnes inclose!
That tongue that tells the story of thy daies,
(Making lasciuious comments on thy sport)
Cannot dispraise, but in a kinde of praise,
Naming thy name, blesses an ill report.
Oh what a mansion haue those vices got,
Which for their habitation chose out thee,
Where beauties vaile doth couer euery blot,
And all things turnes to faire, that eies can see!
Take heed (deare heart) of this large priuiledge,
The hardest knife ill vs'd doth loose his edge.

7. **dispraise, . . . praise,**] *dispraise; . . . praise*, S¹; *dispraise, . . . praise;* G, S²; *dispraise . . . praise;* M, etc. (except Hu¹, Wa); *dispraise . . . praise:* Hu¹, Wa.

9. **vices**] *voices* E.

10. **chose**] *choose* 1640, G¹, S¹, E; *chuse* G², S².

12. **turnes**] *turn* G², etc. (except Ty, Be, N).

14. **loose**] *lose* G, etc.

TYLER: The scandal . . . which the poet had previously mentioned and treated as slander, seems (if it be the same) now to have become too obviously true to admit of being rebutted or extenuated.

6. **sport.** SCHMIDT: Pleasure. ROLFE: Sensuality. [Cf. *Oth.*, II, i, 229: "When the blood is made dull with the act of sport."]

8. STEEVENS: Cf. *A. & C.*, II, ii, 243–45:

> Vilest things
> Become themselves in her; that the holy priests
> Bless her when she is riggish.

9–12. MASSEY: Cf. *R. & J.*, III, ii, 83–85:

> Was ever book containing such vile matter
> So fairly bound? O, that deceit should dwell
> In such a gorgeous palace! (p. 177.)

12. ROLFE: Cf. 40, 13. **turnes.** [TYLER explicitly, and presumably BEECHING and NEILSON, believe that this may be taken transitively, with "vaile" as subject.]

ISAAC: [This and the following sonnet are addressed to the dark lady. . . . Lines 9–12 make the reference to her clear; and lines 4, 7, 8 of S. 96 might well stand in S. 150. Compare the note on S. 70. (*Archiv*, 62: 14, 18.)]

96

SOME say thy fault is youth, some wantonesse,
Some say thy grace is youth and gentle sport,
Both grace and faults are lou'd of more and lesse:
Thou makst faults graces, that to thee resort:
As on the finger of a throned Queene,
The basest Iewell wil be well esteem'd:
So are those errors that in thee are seene,
To truths translated, and for true things deem'd.
How many Lambs might the sterne Wolfe betray,
If like a Lambe he could his lookes translate.
How many gazers mighst thou lead away,
If thou wouldst vse the strength of all thy state?
But doe not so, I loue thee in such sort,
As thou being mine, mine is thy good report.

11. **mighst**] *mightst* L, C, M, etc.

This sonnet was omitted from the *Poems* of 1640 and editions based thereon.

2. **sport.** Cf. 95, 6.

3. BEECHING: [This sonnet] emphasizes the conclusion drawn from 36 that

the friend was a well-known personage. He is some one whom "more and less" (i.e., high and low) discuss. (Intro., p. xxx.) **more and lesse.** MALONE: Cf. *1 H. 4*, IV, iii, 68: "The more and less came in with cap and knee."

4. Cf. 95, 4; 150, 5.

7–8. **errors . . . to truths translated.** TYLER: Vices changed to virtues. [For "truths," cf. note on 54, 2. For "translated," DOWDEN compares *Haml.*, III, i, 113: "The force of honesty can translate beauty into his likeness."]

9. **Lambs . . . Wolfe.** WYNDHAM: [Capitalized because] they are types used as in a fable.

9–10. DOWDEN: The same thought expressed in different imagery appears in 93.

11–12. ISAAC: [Cf. Daniel, S. 17:]

> If her defects have purchas'd her this fame,
> What should her virtues do, her smiles, her love?
> If this her worst, how should her best inflame?
>
> (*Jahrb.*, 17: 174.)

[Cf. 70, 13–14. — ED.]

12. **the strength of all thy state.** SCHMIDT: All thy strength. DOWDEN: The strength of all thy majesty, splendour. TYLER: All the power of thy noble beauty. LEE: The full extent of thy strength. [Cf. notes on 64, 9–10.]

13–14. MALONE: This is likewise the concluding couplet of S. 36. DELIUS: It is evident that the couplet is more in place in S. 36, and probably was borrowed from there for S. 96. (*Jahrb.*, 1: 48.) [According to MASSEY's arrangement, the repetition of the lines is due to the fact that they are now represented as being spoken by the person to whom they were previously addressed, and by such repetition doubled in pathos. (p. 98.)] DOWDEN: [It is possible] that the MS. in Thorpe's hands may here have been imperfect, and that he filled it up so far as to complete 96 with a couplet from an earlier sonnet. (Intro., p. 32n.) ROLFE: [If Dowden's conjecture is accepted, it is another evidence that Sh. had no connection with the publication of the Q. (Intro., rev. ed., p. 13.)] WALSH: [This couplet,] being the same words as the couplet ending 36 (admittedly addressed to the friend), is more likely to have been addressed to a different person, who would not perceive the repetition.

ROLFE: I doubt whether [Sonnets 96–99] have anything to do with "Mr. W. H.," or are addressed to a man.

MASSEY [doubts the Shakespearean authorship of this sonnet, together with that of 130, 145, 151, and 153, "chiefly on the score of bad workmanship," attributing them to Pembroke. (*Ath.*, Mar. 16, 1867, p. 356.)]

[The character sketched in this and the preceding sonnet may well be compared with that of the Don Juan type of hero in the *Lover's Complaint*. — ED.]

97

How like a Winter hath my absence beene
From thee, the pleasure of the fleeting yeare?
What freezings haue I felt, what darke daies seene?
What old Decembers barenesse euery where?
And yet this time remou'd was sommers time,
The teeming Autumne big with ritch increase,
Bearing the wanton burthen of the prime,
Like widdowed wombes after their Lords decease:
Yet this aboundant issue seem'd to me,
But hope of Orphans, and vn-fathered fruite,
For Sommer and his pleasures waite on thee,
And thou away, the very birds are mute.
Or if they sing, tis with so dull a cheere,
That leaues looke pale, dreading the Winters neere.

4. **barenesse**] *barenness* G¹; *barrenness* G², S², E.
6. **The**] *And* C; *Then* Isaac conj.
7. **burthen**] *burden* G², S², E, M, A, Kt, Co, B, Del, Hu, Dy, Sta, Cl, Kly, Hal, Ty, Ox, N, Bull, Wa.
8. **Lords**] *lord's* 1640, G, S, E, Kly, Hal, Ty, Wy; *lords'* C, M, A, Kt, Co, B, Del, Hu, Dy, Sta, Cl, Gl, Wh, Cam, Do, R, Ox, But, etc.
10. **hope**] *crop* Sta conj., But.
14. **Winters**] *winter's* G², S², etc.

DOWDEN: A new group of sonnets seems to begin here. WYNDHAM: The break between this and the preceding sonnet seems the most marked in the First Series.

5. **this time remov'd.** MALONE: This time in which I was remote or absent from thee. SCHMIDT: Time of absence. [Cf. "the absent time," *R. 2*, II, iii, 79.]

6. MALONE: Cf. *M. N. D.*, II, i, 112: "The childing autumn." [Any who wish may find in MASSEY, p. 180, the explanation that this is "subtly allusive" to the fact that Elizabeth Vernon was about to give birth to a child.]

7. **prime.** MALONE: Spring. [Cf. 70, 8. — ED.]

10. **hope of Orphans.** DOWDEN: Such hope as orphans bring; or, expectation of the birth of children whose father is dead. ISAAC: ["Unfather'd fruit" shows that the phrase is objective genitive. (*Archiv*, 62: 4.)] TYLER: Hope of leaving posthumous offspring. BEECHING: Unborn orphans; cf. 60, 13; "times in hope" = unborn times.

13. **cheere.** SCHMIDT: (High) spirits. ROLFE: Countenance; its original sense. [But is it not going too far to detect low spirits in the *faces* of the birds? — ED.]

[ISAAC (*Archiv*, 62: 1) takes the view, already noted from ROLFE, that this and the two following sonnets were not addressed to a man. So MASSEY:] Not only is the whole of their lovely imagery sacred to the sex, as I call it; not only is it so used by Sh. all through his work; not only did Spenser address his lady-love in exactly the same strain, in his Sonnets 35 and 64; . . . but the images had been previously applied *seriatim* by Constable in his *Diana* [see notes on S. 99]. (p. 27.)

ISAAC: [This sonnet might be called] the classical acme of the Renaissance lyric as it grew up in Italy. (*Archiv*, 62: 2.) PRICE [notes that here, as in some other sonnets, there is an exact balance between the masculine and feminine form of cesura, each occurring seven times. "The reader is conscious of the exquisite harmony that results." (p. 373.) See also his note on S. 33.] G. H. PALMER [speaks of the "poignant matter" of this sonnet as "driven home by the vowel *e*." (p. 9.)]

HUDSON [believes that this and the two following sonnets, as well as 109–117 and the "Will" sonnets, were addressed to Anne Hathaway. (*Life, Art, & Characters* of Sh., 1: 24–5.)]

98

From you haue I beene absent in the spring,
When proud pide Aprill (drest in all his trim)
Hath put a spirit of youth in euery thing:
That heauie *Saturne* laught and leapt with him.
Yet nor the laies of birds, nor the sweet smell
Of different flowers in odor and in hew,
Could make me any summers story tell:
Or from their proud lap pluck them where they grew:
Nor did I wonder at the Lillies white,
Nor praise the deepe vermillion in the Rose,
They weare but sweet, but figures of delight:
Drawne after you, you patterne of all those.
Yet seem'd it Winter still, and you away,
As with your shaddow I with these did play.

1. **haue I**] *I have* G^2.
2. **proud pide**] *proud-py'd* E; *proud-pied* M, etc.
3. **Hath**] *Had* But.
5. **Yet nor**] *Yet not* G, S, E.
9. **Lillies**] *lilly's* C; *lily's* Co, Del, Hu, Dy, Sta, Gl, Kly, Wh, Hal, Cam, Do, R, Ox, etc.
11. **weare**] *were* 1640, G etc. **but sweet, but**] *my sweet, but* M conj.; *but fleeting* Lettsom conj., Hu^2; *but, sweet, but* But; *but suite, but* Bulloch conj.
14. **play.**] *play:* M, A, Kt, Co, B, Del, Hu, Dy, Sta, Cl, Gl, Kly, Wh, Hal, Ty, Her, Be.

Lee: Almost all 16th century sonnets on spring in the absence of the poet's love are variations on the sentiment and phraseology of Petrarch's well-known S. 42, "In morte di M. Laura," beginning, "Zefiro torna e'l tel tempo rimena," [etc.] See a translation by Drummond of Hawthornden in Sonnets, pt. 2, No. 9 ["Sweet Spring, thou turn'st with all thy goodly train"]. Similar sonnets and odes on April, spring, and summer abound in French and English (cf. Becq de Fouquière's *Œuvres Choisies de J.-A. de Baif, passim*, and *Œuvres choisies des contemporains de Ronsard*,) p. 108 (by Remy Belleau); p. 129 (by Amadis Jamyn) *et passim*. (*Life*, p. 111.) [This conventionality of theme had been earlier noted by Isaac (*Archiv*, 62: 5–8), who, in addition to the analogues noted by Lee, gives examples from Dante, Surrey ("The soote season, that bud and bloom forth brings"), and Sidney ("In wonted walks").]

1–4. WYNDHAM: The assonance between the two rhyme-sounds, usually a blemish, is here an effect of art. The quick treble repetition of short *i*-sounds seems to have suggested Spring to the Elizabethans. Cf. *A. Y. L.*, V, iii, 20:

> In the spring time, the only pretty ring time,
> When birds do sing, hey ding a ding, ding:
> Sweet lovers love the spring;

and Nash, *Summer's Last Will:*

> Spring, the sweet spring, is the year's pleasant king;
> Then blooms each thing, then maids dance in a ring,
> Cold doth not sting, the pretty birds do sing.

2. MALONE: Cf. *R. & J.*, I, ii, 27: "When well-apparell'd April on the heel of limping winter treads." ROLFE: Sh. refers to April oftener than to any other month. . . . Cf. 3, 10; 21, 7; 104, 7. May, however, is a "close second."

4. **heavie Saturne.** WYNDHAM [quotes Lilly's *Introduction to Astrology*, 1647:] The planet Saturn "is melancholy . . . author of solitariness . . . in labour patient, in arguing or disputing grave . . . in all manner of actions austere." [He is also disposed to view the passage as significant for the date of the sonnet, saying: Sh.] would not, I am convinced, have [introduced Saturn into a description of a particular month of April], had not Saturn been a visible feature in the sky during the month of April to which he refers. . . . Saturn was in opposition, and therefore a somewhat conspicuous feature in the sky, during the month of April in the years 1600, 1601. . . . If, as I hold, Sh. wrote S. 98 with the real Saturn in his mind, then he cannot have written it before 1600 and may, with greater probability, have written it in 1601 or 1602, when Saturn was more conspicuous and gradually presenting a larger disc. (p. 245.) [I have given due space to this interesting argument, but have no notion that it is to be taken seriously. The "Saturn" of the sonnet is not the planet but the god, conceived of as in *Cymb.*, II, v, 12: "The sweet view on't might well have warm'd old Saturn." — ED.]

7. **summers story.** MALONE: By a "summer's story" Sh. seems to have meant some gay fiction. Thus, his comedy founded on the adventures of the king and queen of the fairies he calls A *Midsummer* Night's Dream. On the other hand, in *W.T.* (II, i, 25) he tells us, "A sad tale's best for winter." So also in *Cymb.* (III, iv, 12):

> If 't be summer news
> Smile to 't before; if winterly, thou need'st
> But keep that countenance still.

9–10. LEE: Cf. Barnfield, *Affectionate Shepherd*, I, iii:

> His ivory-white and alabaster skin
> Is stain'd throughout with rare vermilion red. . . .
> But as the lily and the blushing rose,
> So white and red on him in order grows.

11. **but sweet.** MALONE [defending his suggested emendation]: What more could be expected from flowers than that they should be sweet? To gratify the smell is their highest praise. I suspect the compositor caught the word "but" from a subsequent part of the line. STEEVENS: The old reading is surely the true one. The poet refuses to enlarge on the beauty of the flowers, declaring that they are *only* sweet, *only* delightful, so far as they resemble his friend. BEECHING: To [Malone] it is sufficient to reply that "they were but sweet" is a reference back to line 5; and in the following sonnet . . . both sweetness and beauty are dwelt upon. [See 99, 15. — ED.]

11–12. SIMPSON [refers this idea to Plato's doctrine that] the affection can be transferred by association from its primitive object to new ones, and yet the primitive object will still remain the real one. . . . The affection for the new objects, he says, is only the affection for the old one under other denominations and disguises. [See his note on S. 31; and, for both these lines and the "shadow" of line 14, WYNDHAM'S note on 37, 10.]

14. MASSEY [had the extraordinary belief that this line refers to the spring as the shadow or symbol of Lady Vernon, — with a play on her name. (p. 180.)]

MINTO [finds a striking resemblance between this sonnet and one called "Phaeton to his friend Florio," prefixed to Florio's *Second Frutes* (1591):

> Sweet friend whose name agrees with thy increase,
> How fit arrival art thou of the Spring!
> For when each branch hath left his flourishing,
> And green-lock'd Summer's shady pleasures cease,
> She makes the Winter's storms repose in peace,
> And spends her franchise on each living thing:
> The daisies sprout, the little birds do sing,
> Herbs, gums, and plants do vaunt of their release; (etc.)

leading him to believe Sh. the author of the latter. (*Char. of Eng. Poetry*, pp. 371–382.) No one else seems to have been impressed by the comparison.]

99

THE forward violet thus did I chide,
Sweet theefe whence didst thou steale thy sweet that smels
If not from my loues breath, the purple pride,
Which on thy soft cheeke for complexion dwells?
In my loues veines thou hast too grosely died;
The Lillie I condemned for thy hand,
And buds of marierom had stolne thy haire,
The Roses fearefully on thornes did stand,
Our blushing shame, an other white dispaire:
A third nor red, nor white, had stolne of both,
And to his robbry had annext thy breath,
But for his theft in pride of all his growth
A vengfull canker eate him vp to death.
More flowers I noted, yet I none could see,
But sweet, or culler it had stolne from thee.

1. **forward**] *froward* Sharp.
2–5. **Sweet . . . died**] Quoted by Hu[1], Kly, Be.
3. **breath**] *breast* Godwin conj.
3–4. **breath, . . . dwells?**] *breath? . . . dwells* G, Dy, Gl, Cam, Do, Hu[2], R, Wh[2], Ox, etc.; *breath? . . . dwells*, S, E, M, A, Kt, Co, B, Hu[1], Del, Sta, Cl, Kly, Wh[1], Hal, Ty.
7. **marierom**] *marjerom* 1640, G[1], C; *marjoram* G[2], S, E, M, etc.
9. **Our**] *One* S, etc.
13. **eate**] *ate* But.
15. **sweet**] *scent* Walker conj.

MASSEY [was perhaps the first of many commentators to compare this sonnet with Constable's *Diana*, 1st Decade, S. 9:]

My lady's presence makes the roses red,
Because to see her lips they blush for shame.
The lily's leaves, for envy, pale became;
And her white hands in them this envy bred.
The marigold the leaves abroad doth spread;
Because the sun's and her power is the same.
The violet of purple colour came,
Dyed in the blood she made my heart to shed.

In brief, all flowers from her their virtue take;
From her sweet breath their sweet smells do proceed;
The living heat which her eyebeams doth make
Warmeth the ground, and quickeneth the seed.
The rain, wherewith she watereth the flowers,
Falls from mine eyes, which she dissolves in showers.

DOWDEN [compares also Spenser, *Amoretti*, S. 64 (quoted under S. 21).] [Cf. also Daniel, *Delia*, S. 19, "Restore thy tresses to the golden ore," etc. (quoted above under S. 21.) — ED.] WYNDHAM: These flower-sonnets are in a mode imitated from Petrarch, which overran Europe in the 16th century. The Pleïade worked it vigorously and then attacked it, as Sh. attacks it in 21, and again in 130. LEE: Ronsard (*Amours*, i, 140) tells how from the flowers "du beau jardin de son printemps riant" (i.e., from his mistress) come all the sweet perfumes of the East.

1. **forward.** SCHMIDT: Early ripe. BEECHING: Spring. A constant, not a particular, epithet of the violet. Cf. *Haml.*, I, iii, 8:

A violet in the youth of primy nature,
Forward, not permanent, sweet, not lasting.

6. **for thy hand.** MALONE: For presuming to emulate the whiteness of thy hand. DOWDEN: For theft of the whiteness of thy hand. BEECHING: In comparison with. [Dowden's interpretation, which is followed by TYLER and ROLFE, is undoubtedly right. — ED.]

7. **marierom.** MASSEY: The buds of marjoram are of a darkish red-brown hue, and have a peculiar hair-like lustre or glossiness. (p. 180.) DOWDEN: Cf. Suckling's *Brennoralt*, IV, i:

Hair curling, and cover'd like buds of marjoram;
Part tied in negligence, part loosely flowing.

Mr. H. C. Hart tells me that buds of marjoram are dark purple-red before they open, and afterwards pink; dark auburn, I suppose, would be the nearest approach to marjoram in the colour of hair. Mr. Hart suggests that the marjoram has stolen not colour but *perfume* from the young man's hair. Gervase Markham gives sweet marjoram as an ingredient in "The water of sweet smells," and Culpepper says "marjoram is much used in all odoriferous waters." WYNDHAM: The clean, aromatic scent of this sweet herb counted, no doubt, for something in suggesting the simile, but the quotation from Suckling gives the more direct clue. The illustration is, primarily, from the fresh, close-leaved spike of marjoram with the crisp bunch of little buds at its summit. Cf. *T. N. K.*:

His head 's yellow,
Hard hayr'd, and curl'd, thick twind, like ivy-tops.

BEECHING: The passage from Suckling is, of course, only a reminiscence of this line in the sonnet, and does not take us any further. I have a bunch of

half-opened marjoram before me as I write; and the colour is that of the pigment known as "brown madder." The context shows that it is the "colour," and not, as some have thought, the "shape," that is referred to. Mrs. STOPES [(*Ath.*, March 19, 1898, p. 375) describes a portrait of Southampton at Welbeck Abbey, in which the Earl is represented as wearing] his hair not after the fashion of his time, but hanging over his left shoulder in long locks, the ends curling like "buds of marjoram." [This is reproduced in Lee's *Life*, facing p. 144. The question whether the passage is an allusion to color or odor is discussed by W. B. BROWN and others, *N. & Q.*, 11th s., pp. 169, 213, 237. C. C. B. observes (p. 237):] Sh.'s marjoram is usually sweet marjoram, otherwise marjoram gentle, the flowers of which are white, and probably it is of this variety that he speaks here, the flowers of this and the preceding sonnet being mostly garden flowers. . . . Is it possible that Sh. is reminded of some pomade used by his friend? . . . In an old book of receipts for cosmetics, etc. (*The Toilet of Flora*, 1779), I find two washes for the hair into which marjoram enters.

8. **on thornes.** ROLFE: A quibbling allusion to the proverbial expression, "to stand on thorns." Cf. *W.T.*, IV, iv, 595: "O the thorns we stand upon!"

9. VERITY: Cf. *Lucrece*, 479: "And the red rose blush at her own disgrace."

12. MALONE: Cf. *R. & J.*, II, iii, 30: "Full soon the canker death eats up that plant"; and *V. & A.*, 656: "This canker that eats up love's tender spring."

[With reference to this sonnet's having 15 lines, BUTLER observes that the interrogation mark at the end of line 4 in the Q] is what Sh. doubtless wrote in the first instance — intending the quatrain to end with a question. He probably canceled the query — or forgot to cancel it — and added the fifth line, because until he did so the query remained unanswered, unless by bringing the answer to the preceding query over. BEECHING: It may be conjectured that we have here only a rough draft of the sonnet. The correspondence of line 1 to line 6 shows that the first line was not an afterthought; and the repetition of the reference to "breath" in line 11 suggests that Sh. used a quatrain already written (lines 2–5) for his passage about the violet, intending afterwards to reduce it to three lines by limiting the parallel to "complexion." LEE: Many sonnets of 15 lines appear in Barnes's *Parthenophil*, e.g., 35, 36, 38, 39, 40, etc. [In all these cases the extra line introduces the final couplet, and rhymes with the 12th. — ED.]

BRANDL [considers that this sonnet is almost certainly addressed to a woman. (p. xix.) So ROLFE:] Even in Elizabethan times, when extravagant eulogies of manly beauty were so common, do we find the poet dwelling upon his "love's breath" or the "lily" whiteness of his hand? From first to last, the sweetness and loveliness described in the verses are unmistakably feminine. (Intro., rev. ed., p. 24.)

G. WILSON, [in his *Five Gateways of Knowledge*, refers to this as a poem which] beautifully weaves together the eye, the nostril, and the ear, each as it were like instruments in an orchestra, in turn playing the air, and then falling back into an accompaniment, so that now it is colour which is most prominent

before us, and then smell, and then sound, and thereafter through colour we return to sound and fragrance again. (p. 78.)

[A repulsive and impossible interpretation of the sonnet was proposed by CREIGHTON (together with 115 and 124) in *Blackwood's*, 169: 837–43.]

100

WHERE art thou Muse that thou forgetst so long,
To speake of that which giues thee all thy might?
Spendst thou thy furie on some worthlesse songe,
Darkning thy powre to lend base subiects light.
Returne forgetfull Muse, and straight redeeme,
In gentle numbers time so idely spent,
Sing to the eare that doth thy laies esteeme,
And giues thy pen both skill and argument.
Rise resty Muse, my loues sweet face suruay,
If time haue any wrincle grauen there,
If any, be a *Satire* to decay,
And make times spoiles dispised euery where.
Giue my loue fame faster then time wasts life,
So thou preuenst his sieth, and crooked knife.

4. **light.**] *light?* G, etc. (except But); *light!* But.
8. **giues**] *give* 1640, G, S, E.
9. **resty**] *restive* M, A, B, Kly, Ty; *rested* But conj.
10. **haue**] *hath* G, S, E.
14. **preuenst**] *prevent'st* G, etc.

DOWDEN: Written after a cessation from sonnet-writing, during which Sh. had been engaged in authorship, — writing plays for the public as I suppose, instead of poems for his friend. WYNDHAM: [The group 100–125] opens after a great silence, . . . and the poet develops in it a single sustained attack on the Law of Change. . . . In its survey it goes over the old themes with a soft and silvery touch: Beauty and Decay, Love, Constancy, the immortalizing of the friend's beauty conceived as an incarnation of Ideal Beauty. (Intro., pp. cxiii-cxiv.) BUTLER: [The sonnet appears to have been written] after a considerable interval during which Sh. has found other things to write about, but has not yet (so it would seem) become a playwright. [With the theme of silence, and the excuse given in the following sonnet, cf. 83–85. — ED.]

1. **so long.** BEECHING: Three years; see 104, 3.
2. TYLER: Cf. 78, 13.

3. **furie.** SCHMIDT: Exaltation of fancy. [Cf. *L. L. L.*, IV, iii, 229: "What zeal, what fury hath inspir'd thee now?"] BEECHING: A word borrowed from the classics, and used as by them of prophetic inspiration. **worthlesse songe.** PORTER: The sonnet sequence (86–96) preceding suits the description of it as "darkning" power and lending light to "base subjects," i.e., falsity and distrust in love.

8. LEE: Cf. Ronsard, *Amours*, ii, 12: "Ma plume sinon vous ne sçait autre sujet," etc. [For "argument," cf. note on 38, 3.]

9. **resty.** SCHMIDT: Stiff with too much rest, torpid. [Cf. *Edw. III*, III, iii, 161:

> And presently they are as resty-stiff
> As 't were a many over-ridden jades.]

DYCE [cites Coles's Latin Dictionary (1677), as giving "resty" = "piger, lentus."] TYLER [defends the emendation "restive,"] as equivalent to "uneasy," "in aimless motion," "wandering." Cf. "truant Muse," 101, 1. Sh.'s Muse had not been *at rest* (lines 3–4). [Tyler also discusses the subject in *N. & Q.*, 8th s., 2: 283; and C. C. B. (*ibid.*, 4: 444) cites two instances of the word from *Pappe with an Hatchet*, meaning "uneasy, liable to bolt."] WYNDHAM: A term of manege applied to a horse exhibiting the vice now called "jibbing." [From a review in the *Spectator*, Aug. 15, 1891, p. 231, he cites an account of a "correction to be used against restiveness," which appeared in a book by Flatman, 1597. It concludes: "The shrill crie of a hedgehog being strait tied by the foot under the horse's tail is a reminder of like force, which was proved by maister Vincentio Respino, a Neapolitan, who corrected by this means an old restive horse of the King's in such sort, as he had much ado afterwards to keep him from the contrarie vice of running away." The *N. E. D.* cites, under "resty," Cooper's *Thesaurus*, 1565: "Restie and slow from lack of use."]

10–11. BUTLER: These lines suggest that Mr. W. H.'s good looks were beginning to go off, though not so strongly as the opening lines of S. 104, nor the concluding ones of 108.

11. **Satire.** WALKER: Satirist. [Cf. Jonson, *Poetaster*, V, i: "The honest satyr hath the happiest soul"; and other contemporary examples. SCHMIDT, on the other hand, lists the word under the impersonal noun.]

12. **times spoiles.** [Sonnets 63–64 are the best comment on this phrase. — ED.]

14. **prevenst.** STEEVENS: By anticipation hinderest.

SHARP: This sonnet may . . . afford a clue towards dating this section of the sequence, for it may contain a reference to the Dark Woman series: here Sh. may have noted his turning away from the deceitful love of an evil woman. . . . "Instead of wasting thy poetic enthusiasm . . . in casting a glamour over base subjects," etc. ["Casting a glamour" is an odd phrase for the sonnets that depict the Dark Woman! — ED.]

101

Oh truant Muse what shalbe thy amends,
For thy neglect of truth in beauty di'd?
Both truth and beauty on my loue depends:
So dost thou too, and therein dignifi'd:
Make answere Muse, wilt thou not haply saie,
Truth needs no collour with his collour fixt,
Beautie no pensell, beauties truth to lay:
But best is best, if neuer intermixt.
Because he needs no praise, wilt thou be dumb?
Excuse not silence so, for't lies in thee,
To make him much out-liue a gilded tombe:
And to be praisd of ages yet to be.
Then do thy office Muse, I teach thee how,
To make him seeme long hence, as he showes now.

3. **Both**] *But* 1640, G, S, E.
6. **fixt**] *mix'd* But.
6–8. **Truth . . . intermixt**] Italics by M, A, Kly, Co^{3}, Hu^{2}; quoted by Kt, Co^{1,2}, B, Hu^{1}, Del, Dy, Sta, Cl, Gl, Wh, Hal, Cam, Do, R, Ty, Ox, Wy, Her, etc.
10. **not**] *no* G, S, E. **for't**] *for it* M, A, Kt, B, Kly, Co^{3}.
11. **him**] *her* 1640, G, S, E.
14. **him . . . he**] *her . . . she* 1640, G, S, E.

[C. A. Brown makes this the envoy of his "fourth poem," Sonnets 78–101.]

[Mr. Horace Davis notes the resemblance of this sonnet to 83–84. Cf. especially line 6 with 83, 1–2, and line 4 with 84, 8.]

2. Wyndham [finds here again the platonic idea of beauty:] He argues that the Idea of Beauty, embodied in his friend's beauty, of which all other beautiful things are shadows, is also Truth: an exact coincidence with an "eternal form" to which transitory presentments do but approximate. [Cf. 62, 6.] (Intro., p. cxxiv.) [See, however, for a sufficient explanation of the passage, my note on 54, 2. — Ed.]

3. Walsh: Cf. 14, 11 and 14. **depends.** [For the singular, see Abbott's note on 41, 3.]

6. **collour.** Wyndham: The poet plays on the word, which, in the first instance, means defence, extenuation. Beeching: His truth needs no praise, or "colour," because his own "colour," or beauty, sufficiently fixes it. [The meaning is rather "plausible pretence" or "semblance," with an emphasis on

false or artificial semblance. Wyndham's gloss is not supported by the passage which he cites from *1 H. 6*, II, iv, 34: "I love no colours, and without all colour of base insinuating flattery," etc. SCHMIDT more aptly cites *Haml.*, III, iv, 130: "What I have to do will want true colour, tears perchance for blood." ROLFE says that "*his* colour" is "that of my friend"; I should say "its own colour," referring to truth. — ED.] **fixt.** SCHMIDT: Native and unchangeable. WYNDHAM: Here a term of painting. . . . Cf. *W.T.*, V, iii, 47: "The statue is but newly fix'd, the colour's not dry." BUTLER [defends his wholly unnecessary emendation, "mixt," by showing that Sh. elsewhere uses such rhymes as *press: express*, etc.]

7. **lay.** SCHMIDT: Apply as a colour. [Cf. *T.N.*, I, v, 258:

> 'T is beauty truly blent, whose red and white
> Nature's own sweet and cunning hand laid on.]

DRAKE: [In this sonnet Sh. distinctly marks] the sex, the dignity, the rank, and moral virtue of his friend. (*Sh. & his Times*, 2: 69.)

102

My loue is strengthned though more weake in seeming
I loue not lesse, thogh lesse the show appeare,
That loue is marchandiz'd, whose ritch esteeming,
The owners tongue doth publish euery where.
Our loue was new, and then but in the spring,
When I was wont to greet it with my laies,
As *Philomell* in summers front doth singe,
And stops his pipe in growth of riper daies:
Not that the summer is lesse pleasant now
Then when her mournefull himns did hush the night,
But that wild musick burthens euery bow,
And sweets growne common loose their deare delight.
Therefore like her, I some-time hold my tongue:
Because I would not dull you with my songe.

3. **marchandiz'd**] *merchandiz'd* G, etc.
6. **with**] *in* G, S, E.
8. **his**] *her* Housman, Walker conj., Kt, B, Del, Hu, Dy, Sta, Cl, Gl, Kly, Hal, Cam, Co³, Do, R, Wh², Ox, Her, etc.
11. **burthens**] *burdens* G², S², E, M, Co, B, Del, Hu, Dy, Sta, Cl, Hal, N, Bull.
12. **loose**] *lose* G, etc.

3. **marchandiz'd.** *CAPELL: Cf. *L. L. L.*, II, i, 13–16:

> My beauty, though but mean,
> Needs not the painted flourish of your praise.
> Beauty is bought by judgement of the eye,
> Not utter'd by base sale of chapmen's tongues.

5–6. GOLLANCZ: The poet definitely identifies the friend addressed with the patron of his early poems. (Intro., p. xx.) BEECHING: The whole point of the sonnet is lost unless we refer it to the earlier sonnets. [I know not on what ground any reader may claim to have information as to just what writings are here referred to. — ED.]

7. **summers front.** MALONE: Cf. *W.T.*, IV, iv, 3: "Flora, peering in April's front"; and *Cor.*, II, i, 57: "The forehead of the morning."

8. **his.** [The only question as to the emendation is as to whether it should be made here or in line 10; and, as BEECHING observes,] The singing nightingale in Sh. is always female. Cf. *M.V.*, V, i, 104; *R. & J.*, III, v, 4.

103

ALACK what pouerty my Muse brings forth,
That hauing such a skope to show her pride,
The argument all bare is of more worth
Then when it hath my added praise beside.
Oh blame me not if I no more can write!
Looke in your glasse and there appeares a face,
That ouer-goes my blunt inuention quite,
Dulling my lines, and doing me disgrace.
Were it not sinfull then striuing to mend,
To marre the subiect that before was well,
For to no other passe my verses tend,
Then of your graces and your gifts to tell.
And more, much more then in my verse can sit,
Your owne glasse showes you, when you looke in it.

10. **well,**] *well?* L, etc.
13. **sit**] *fit* Del conj.

[With the content of this sonnet cf. the very similar thought of S. 84. Mr. HORACE DAVIS notes also the resemblance of this sonnet, and 105, to S. 76. Cf. especially the repetition of the words "pride," "argument," "invention."]

VON MAUNTZ: Cf. Ovid, *Tristia*, I, v, 53–56:

> Si vox infragilis, pectus mihi firmius aere,
> Pluraque cum linguis pluribus ora forent:
> Non tamen idcirco complecterer omnia verbis,
> Materia vires exsuperante meas.

3. **argument.** See note on 38, 3. **all bare.** DOWDEN: Merely as it is in itself.

7. **blunt.** SCHMIDT: Clumsy. **invention.** Cf. 38, 8; 59, 3; 76, 6.

9–10. MALONE: Cf. *K.J.*, IV, ii, 28–29:

> When workmen strive to do better than well,
> They do confound their skill;

and *Lear*, I, iv, 369: "Striving to better, oft we mar what's well."

11. **passe.** TYLER: The word here is probably figurative, the metaphor being perhaps derived from the pass in fencing. BEECHING: The word usually implies an embarrassing situation, and there may be a suggestion of that sense here. ROLFE: Issue, result. [So the *N. E. D.*, which cites the line under the meaning "event, issue."]

12. **gifts.** WALSH: Perhaps intended to include reference to presents; cf. "bounty" in 53, 11.

13. **sit.** Cf. 37, 7.

13–14. STOPES: Perhaps the poorest of all Sh.'s sonnet endings.

104

To me faire friend you neuer can be old,
For as you were when first your eye I eyde,
Such seemes your beautie still: Three Winters colde,
Haue from the forrests shooke three summers pride,
Three beautious springs to yellow *Autumne* turn'd,
In processe of the seasons haue I seene,
Three Aprill perfumes in three hot Iunes burn'd,
Since first I saw you fresh which yet are greene.
Ah yet doth beauty like a Dyall hand,
Steale from his figure, and no pace perceiu'd,
So your sweete hew, which me thinkes still doth stand
Hath motion, and mine eye may be deceaued.
For feare of which, heare this thou age vnbred,
Ere you were borne was beauties summer dead.

1. **friend**] *love* 1640, G, S, E.
3. **Winters**] *winters'* Walker conj., Kt, Dy, Sta, Cl, Hu², Bull.
4. **forrests**] *forest* G², S², E.
10. **pace**] *place* 1640, G, S, E.
11. **doth**] *do* G¹; *does* G², S, E.
14. **were**] *was* G, S, E. **beauties**] *beatties* 1640.

[A number of commentators have found this sonnet of special interest because the mention of the definite period of three years seemed to give hope of a clue to some of the time-relations of the Sonnets. SARRAZIN, in particular, has taken it as a key-sonnet for the dating of the collection (*Jahrb.*, 34: 368–71), making a special study of its style with relation to that of the plays. With line 2 he compares *R. 2*, IV, i, 285: "Is this the face which fac'd so many follies?"; with lines 3–7, *R. 2*, I, iii, 141 ("Till twice five summers have enrich'd our fields") and 214 ("Four lagging winters and four wanton springs"), *R. & J.*, I, ii, 10 ("Let two more summers wither in their pride"), and *M. N. D.*, I, i, 7–8:

Four days will quickly steep themselves in night,
Four nights will quickly dream away the time;

with line 9, *Lucrece*, 327 ("The hourly dial who with a ling'ring stay his course doth let"), *R. 2*, V, v, 53 ("Whereto my finger, like a dial's point"), *1 H. 4*, V, ii, 84 ("If life did ride upon a dial's point"), *R. & J.*, II, iv, 118 ("The bawdy hand of the dial"), etc.; the conclusion being that the sonnet is in Sh.'s

style of the period 1594–6. Hence, if the Sonnets were begun three years before, we may date the earlier ones about 1592. Without dissenting from this view of the date of S. 104, I am unable to see how Sarrazin and others can have assurance either that the opening sonnets of the present collection are the first ones which Sh. addressed to the friend of S. 104, or that he wrote them at precisely the time when first the friend's eye he eyed. — ED.]

ISAAC [compares this sonnet with Daniel's *Delia*, S. 36:

> When men shall find thy flower, thy glory pass,
> And thou, with careful brow, sitting alone,
> Received hast this message from thy glass,
> That tells the truth, and says that "All is gone"; etc.]

1. BUTLER: It would seem as though Mr. W. H. had been saying something to Sh. about his looking old.

2. **your eye.** TYLER: [Cf. 1, 5 and note.]

3. **Winters.** DYCE [defends his reading of this as possessive, in which he anticipated Walker's conjecture (*Crit. Exam.*, 2: 100), and approves Walker's remark that "the syntax, though ungrammatical according to our present notions, is perfectly Elizabethan."]

3–8. TYLER: [This, in conjunction with indications of the spring of 1601 as the date of Sonnets 100–126 (see notes on 107 and 124), indicates the spring of 1598 as the time when Sh.'s acquaintance with Mr. W. H. began. (Intro., p. 27.)] LEE: The period seems to have been more or less conventional among the sonneteers. Cf. Ronsard's *Sonnets pour Helène*, i, 14, which begins, "Trois ans sont ja passez que ton œil me tient pris," and Daniel, *Sonnets after Astrophel*, No. 17 (of his love): "That was with blood and three years' witness signed."

4. GOLDWIN SMITH: Cf. Horace: "Sylvis honorem decutit." (*Sh. the Man*, p. 12.) [Apparently a confused reference to Vergil, *Georg.*, 2: 404: "Silvis Aquilo decussit honorem." — ED.]

7. BEECHING: The image seems to be from throwing incense on a fire.

10. MALONE: Cf. 77, 7–8.

11. **hew.** Cf. 20, 7, and notes. **me thinkes.** [ABBOTT feels bound to accent "me" here, though he admits that Shakespearean practice is not conclusive for such usage. (§ 492.)]

13–14. **thou . . . you.** [For the change of pronoun cf. 24, 5–6, and notes. STENGEL (*Eng. Stud.*, 4: 10) thinks that the discrepancy should be removed from the text. It is possible that in line 14 the poet is thinking of the various members of posterity, and, addressing them, says "Ere *you* were born." — ED.]

14. Cf. 68, 13–14.

WALSH: With the two ideas in this sonnet (the apparent permanence of beauty and ultimate triumph of decay) is to be compared [S. 126.]

105

Let not my loue be cal'd Idolatrie,
Nor my beloued as an Idoll show,
Since all alike my songs and praises be
To one, of one, still such, and euer so.
Kinde is my loue to day, to morrow kinde,
Still constant in a wondrous excellence,
Therefore my verse to constancie confin'de,
One thing expressing, leaues out difference.
Faire, kinde, and true, is all my argument,
Faire, kinde and true, varrying to other words,
And in this change is my inuention spent,
Three theams in one, which wondrous scope affords.
Faire, kinde, and true, haue often liu'd alone.
Which three till now, neuer kept seate in one.

1. **be**] *by* G¹.

9, 10, 13. **Faire . . . true**] Quoted by Gl, Cam, Do, R, Wh², Ox, Wy, Her, etc. [In 13 Be reads: "Fair," "kind," and "true."]

14. **neuer kept seate**] *never sate* G¹; *did never sit* G²; *have never sate* S, E.

[For the general content of this sonnet, cf. S. 76. — Ed.]

1. Wyndham: His love is not idolatry since he worships only at one shrine. Beeching: There could be monidolatry as well as monotheism. "Since" means "on the ground that." The poet says, "Let not my entire devotion to one friend be called idolatry." [This interpretation of Beeching's is confirmed by Sh.'s usual employment of the word. — Ed.]

2. **show.** For the intransitive use, cf. 101, 14.

8. **leaves out difference.** Schmidt [defines "difference" as "variety," as in *A. Y. L.*, II, i, 6: "The seasons' difference."] Rolfe: Omits reference to other qualities.

9–12. Rolfe: Cf. *M.V.*, II, vi, 53–56:

> For she is wise, if I can judge of her,
> And fair she is, if that mine eyes be true,
> And true she is, as she hath prov'd herself,
> And therefore, like herself, wise, fair, and true.

[Karpf, who finds in the Sonnets an elaboration of Aristotelian philosophy, sees in this trinity of qualities the True, Good, and Beautiful of Aristotle's *göttliche Vernunft.* (pp. 123–24.) The same notion is echoed by Wyndham,

who calls the triad "nothing else than the three primal categories of philosophy." — Than which, I fancy, nothing could more surprise Sh. — ED.]

11. **invention.** See note on 76, 6.

12. HORACE DAVIS: Cf. Constable, *Diana*, 1st Decade, S. 10:

> Heralds at arms do three perfections quote,
> To wit, most fair, most rich, most glittering;
> So, when those three concur within one thing,
> Needs must that thing of honour be a note.

13. [BEECHING was the first, I think, to punctuate this line intelligently, quoting *separately* the three adjective-nouns. — ED.]

SHINDLER: [Since the complaint of monotony here implied cannot be brought against the sonnets of our collection, we have] a clear indication that we have lost . . . a considerable number. (*Gent. Mag.*, 272: 78.)

CREIGHTON: [This sonnet] might be headed with the Pembroke motto: *Ung je servirai*. (*Blackwood's*, 169: 674.) [Those who are fain to thread the dance of the Pembrokists and Southamptonists will rejoice to find that BRANDL (p. xxxvii) sees in line 4 the motto of the house of Southampton, *Ung par tout, tout par ung*.]

106

WHEN in the Chronicle of wasted time,
I see discriptions of the fairest wights,
And beautie making beautifull old rime,
In praise of Ladies dead, and louely Knights,
Then in the blazon of sweet beauties best,
Of hand, of foote, of lip, of eye, of brow,
I see their antique Pen would haue exprest,
Euen such a beauty as you maister now.
So all their praises are but prophesies
Of this our time, all you prefiguring,
And for they look'd but with deuining eyes,
They had not still enough your worth to sing:
For we which now behold these present dayes,
Haue eyes to wonder, but lack toungs to praise.

7. **antique**] *antick* G, S, E. **exprest**] *express* G^1.
8. **Euen**] *E'en* S^1.
12. **still**] *skill* Tyr conj., C, M, etc. (except Wy).
13. **which**] *who* G, S, E.

1–4. DRAKE: It is highly probable that our bard alluded to Chaucer [in these lines.] (*Sh. & his Times*, 2: 79.) [HALES suggested to Dowden that Sh. may have been thinking of the *Faerie Queene*.]

3. [Surely a plausible competitor for the claim to be the loveliest line in the Sonnets. Note the rhythm of the last two feet. — ED.]

5. **blazon.** BEECHING: The description or proclamation of a coat of arms. . . . It is noteworthy, in relation to the date of the Sonnets, that all the other instances of the use of the word by Sh. are subsequent to the application for a grant of arms in 1596.

7. **antique.** See note on 19, 10.

7–8. LEE [again compares Spenser's sonnet to Lord Howard, cited under 59, 13–14.]

8. **maister.** SCHMIDT: Possess. [Cf. *Lucrece*, 863: "Leaves it (his gold) to be master'd by his young."]

9–10. MAIN: Cf. Constable's 7th Sonnet:

> Miracle of the world, I never will deny
> That former poets praise the beauty of their days;
> But all those beauties were but figures of thy praise,
> And all those poets did of thee but prophesy.

[DOWDEN refers this sonnet of Constable's to the *Diana;* instead, it is the 7th of the *Miscellaneous Sonnets;* on which BEECHING observes:] The sonnet is not in *Diana;* it is therefore subsequent to 1594; and as the last line, "which only we without idolatry adore," looks like a reference to Sh.'s 105th Sonnet, it is most probable that Constable is quoting Sh. here also.

11. **devining.** ROLFE: Only guessing.

12. **still.** DOWDEN: A meaning may be forced [from the Q reading:] "Only divining your beauty, they did not as yet possess enough to sing your worth." WYNDHAM: [The emendation "skill"] has been universally adopted, but it puts the sense of the last six lines out of focus. . . . In lines 1–8 the poet defers, here as elsewhere, to the artistic excellence of the antique presentment of beauty. [Cf. note on 83, 7.] . . . He assumes that the ideal is, as we say, the classic, the type determined long since by a tradition of great artists. . . . Although they *could* write — could, indeed, "blazon sweet beauty's best" — *still* they lacked something essential, viz. the model which we can behold and wonder at, "but lack tongues to praise." BEECHING: The skill that [the old poets] lacked was not the skill to sing, but to fill out the ideal from the "figures" of their own day. Their eyes were only "divining eyes," but they sang up to the full limit of their vision; we moderns, on the contrary, who see the ideal beauty, lack tongue to sing it. If we read "still," there is no noun for "enough" to refer to.

[It may be of interest to compare the "When . . . then" structure of this sonnet with the similar form of 2, 12, 15, and 30. — ED.]

[WALSH puts the sonnet with 59, another study of the same theme.]

107

Not mine owne feares, nor the prophetick soule,
Of the wide world, dreaming on things to come,
Can yet the lease of my true loue controule,
Supposde as forfeit to a confin'd doome.
The mortall Moone hath her eclipse indur'de,
And the sad Augurs mock their owne presage,
Incertenties now crowne them-selues assur'de,
And peace proclaimes Oliues of endlesse age,
Now with the drops of this most balmie time,
My loue lookes fresh, and death to me subscribes,
Since spight of him Ile liue in this poore rime,
While he insults ore dull and speachlesse tribes.
And thou in this shalt finde thy monument,
When tyrants crests and tombs of brasse are spent.

3. **my**] *thy* E.
8. **Oliues**] *a lease* Godwin conj.
11. **Ile**] *thou'lt* Stengel conj. **rime**] *time* L.
13. **shalt**] *shall* Wa.

[This sonnet is of chief interest because of the suggestion it gives of allusion to external events, which has led to widely divergent conjectures respecting the date of composition. It seems to have been one "J. G. R.," a correspondent of *N. & Q.*, (2d s., 7: 125; Feb. 12, 1859), who unwittingly opened the long discussion. He interprets the sonnet as referring to Southampton's imprisonment, the death of Queen Elizabeth, and the accession of James, — the theory which still seems to claim the majority of adherents. Massey develops this at length:] Sh. thus addresses Southampton upon his release from the Tower, at the time of the Queen's death in 1603. (p. 203.) In his Essays Bacon tells us, "It was generally believed that after the death of Elizabeth England should come to utter confusion." (Works, 1856, i, 291.) Elizabeth herself prognosticated that her death would be followed by the overthrow of the Protestant religion and ruin of the realm. As Froude says, "Sometimes in mockery she would tell the Council that she would come back after her death and see the Queen of Scots making their heads fly!" . . . [Cf. also the dedicatory epistle of the Authorized Version:] "For whereas it was the expectation of many, who wished not well to our Sion, that upon the setting of that bright occidental star, Queen Elizabeth, of most happy memory, some thick and pal-

pable clouds of darkness would so have overshadowed the land, that men should have been in doubt which way they were to walk, and that it should hardly be known who was to direct the unsettled State; the appearance of your Majesty, as of the sun in its strength, instantly dispelled those supposed and surmised mists, and gave unto all that were well affected exceeding cause of comfort; especially when we beheld the Government established in your Highness and your hopeful seed by an undoubted Title, and this also accompanied with peace and tranquillity at home and abroad." . . . It is impossible to have any reasonable doubt that the same spirit pervades [this dedication and S. 107;] that the same death is recorded; the same fears are alluded to; the same exultation is expressed; the same peace identified. (pp. 215–16.) . . . There can be no doubt that the sonnet chronicles a death, and hints at burial in a tyrant's tomb. . . . [The Queen's] death is a subject of rejoicing to Sh. It is not necessary to say that he rejoiced personally, but he does so dramatically. (p. 218.) . . . Chamberlain, writing to Dudley Carleton, April, 1603, says, "The 10th of this month the Earl of Southampton was delivered out of the Tower by warrant from the King," sent by Lord Kinloss — "These bountiful beginnings raise all men's spirits, and put them in great hopes." (p. 334.) ISAAC, [taking the sonnet to be addressed to Essex, interprets it as of the year 1598:] In this year . . . the intimate relations between Elizabeth and her favorite suffered an apparently incurable breach through the box on the ear which the latter received during a session of the Privy Council. Essex in resentment kept himself for some months away from the court, and in spite of the remonstrances of his friends made not the slightest attempt at a reconciliation. . . . Finally on the 15th of September he appeared for the first time again at court, and on the 3rd of October stood again in the old favor with the Queen. (Devereux: *Lives of the Earls of Essex.*) This reconciliation must have filled all the friends of the Earl with great joy, and could also have occasioned the writing of this beautiful sonnet by the poet who had been oppressed by the worst anxieties. A further reference, however, than to this merely private dissension of the Queen and her favorite [seems to be indicated by line 8.] . . . On the 13th of September the irreconcilable enemy of England, Philip II of Spain, had died; this event Sh. could represent with good ground as the beginning of an era of peace. . . . [Still another possibility is a reference to the death of Essex's most powerful enemy, Lord Burleigh, in the same year.] (*Jahrb.*, 19: 263–64.) TYLER [makes the sonnet refer to the putting down of the rebellion of Essex, 1601,] an event which, it is not difficult to see, might be spoken of as a threatening eclipse, and from which the Queen might be represented as having come forth with her glory undimmed. . . . Within a week of the abortive attempt of Essex to call out the citizens of London, Secretary Cecil, according to a document in the Record Office, delivered himself to the following effect: "As the declining of the Sun bringes generall darkness, so her Majesties hurt is our continuall night; and although the one by course of Nature may be renewed, yet the other will hardly be matched in any future age; how odious then ought they to be in the eye of all good subjects that have sought the utter ruine of so blessed a sover-

aine." (State Papers, Domestic, Elizabeth, cclxxviii.) What Sh. says about the "eclipse of the mortal moon" may be advantageously compared also with the following extract from a letter of Bacon's written to the Queen prior to the rebellion: "The devices of some that would put out all your Majesty's lights, and fall on reckoning how many years you have reigned, which I beseech our blessed Saviour may be doubled, and that I may never live to see any eclipse of your glory" (Spedding's *Bacon*, 9: 160). There can thus be no doubt that the language of the sonnet would be entirely in accordance with the usage of the time. [Line 6] is a description which, we may well believe, would, after the affair of Sunday, February 8, 1601, aptly describe the feelings of those who had predicted the success of Essex. And then in [lines 7–8] we may find, with probability, an allusion to the embassy sent by James, the Scotch king, to congratulate the Queen on putting down the rebellion. The "incertainties" may refer to the previously doubtful attitude of James. . . . Further, the words of the 9th line . . . contain, as seems likely, an allusion to the season of the year when the sonnet was written, probably the spring or early summer of 1601. (Intro., pp. 23–24.) LEE: [This sonnet] makes references that cannot be mistaken to three events that took place in 1603 — to Queen Elizabeth's death, to the accession of James I, and to the release of the Earl of Southampton, who had been in prison since he was convicted in 1601 of complicity in the rebellion of the Earl of Essex. . . . It is in almost identical phrase that every pen in the spring of 1603 was felicitating the nation on the unexpected turn of events, by which Elizabeth's crown had passed, without civil war, to the Scottish King, and thus the revolution that had been foretold as the inevitable consequence of Elizabeth's demise was happily averted. Cynthia (i.e., the moon) was the Queen's recognised poetic appellation. It is thus that she figures in the verse of Barnfield, Spenser, Fulke Greville, and Ralegh, and her elegists involuntarily followed the same fashion. "Fair Cynthia's dead" sang one. "Luna's extinct," . . . wrote Henry Petowe, in his "A Fewe Aprill Drops Showered on the Hearse of Dead Eliza," 1603. There was hardly a verse-writer who mourned her loss that did not typify it, moreover, as the eclipse of a heavenly body. One poet asserted that death "veiled her glory in a cloud of night." Another argued: "Naught can eclipse her light, but that her star will shine in darkest night." A third varied the formula thus:

> When winter had cast off her weed
> Our sun eclipsed did set. Oh! light most fair.

(These quotations are from *Sorrowes Joy*, a collection of elegies on Queen Elizabeth by Cambridge writers (Cambridge, 1603), and from Chettle's *England's Mourning Garment* (London, 1603).) At the same time James was constantly said to have entered on his inheritance "not with an olive branch in his hand, but with a whole forest of olives round about him, for he brought not peace to this kingdom alone" but to all Europe. (Gervase Markham's *Honour in her Perfection*, 1624.) [Line 9] is an echo of another current strain of fancy. James came to England in a springtide of rarely rivalled clemency, which was

reckoned of the happiest augury. "All things look fresh," one poet sang, "to greet his excellence." "The air, the seasons, and the earth" were represented as in sympathy with the general joy in "this sweetest of all sweet springs." One source of grief alone was acknowledged: Southampton was still a prisoner in the Tower, "supposed as forfeit to a confined doom." All men, wrote Manningham, the diarist, on the day following the Queen's death, wished him at liberty. The wish was fulfilled quickly. . . . Samuel Daniel and John Davies celebrated Southampton's release in buoyant verse. It is improbable that Sh. remained silent. (*Life*, pp. 147–49.) WYNDHAM [places less stress on allusions to contemporary events:] This sonnet is . . . a limb of the sustained attack on Time (100–125), which culminates in a denial of its reality (123–124.) The sense seems to be: "Not mine own fears (expressed in 104), nor the whole world's prophetic expectation of things to come, . . . can limit the continuation of my love, which, in common with all things, seems, but only seems, subject to limitation." . . . It suffices for the sense [of lines 5–8] that they do point to some crisis, in nature or politics, which excited an apprehension not justified by the event. . . . I am disposed to think [that the reference is to] an actual eclipse of the moon, which had been made the ground for gloomy prognostications. When contemporary poets allude to political crises they make their reference explicit. Drayton, e.g., in *Idea*, 51, . . . has —

> Lastly, mine eyes amazedly have seen
> Essex's great fall! Tyrone his peace to gain!
> The quiet end of that long living Queen!
> This King's fair entrance! and our peace with Spain!

Sh. in the Sonnets has no such explicit references, and his phrase, "the mortal moon," if it mean "the moon in deadly case," is quite in his manner of describing a natural phenomenon such as an eclipse. There were 21 eclipses of the moon, total or partial, visible at Greenwich during the years 1592–1609. So that the champions of an early date for the Sonnets may find their affair in this matter as readily as the champions of a late date. But if we accept Tyler's suggestion that the reference to "this most balmy time" proves that the sonnet was written in late spring, summer, or early autumn, and if my suggestion for the dating of S. 98 be also accepted, then, of such eclipses, three remain available: [June 4, 1602; May 24, 1603; Apr. 3, 1605.] The eclipse of May 24, 1603, since it lasted much longer than the eclipse of April 3, 1605, and since, owing to its hour [11.30 P.M.] and the time of the year, it must have been more noticeable than the eclipse of June 4, 1602, may, perhaps, be given the pride of place. Its acceptance also admits of one of those secondary allusions — in this case to the death of Elizabeth, March 23, 1603 — which are so common in Sh.'s verse. I ought to add that Mr. Heath and Mr. Blaikie agree in thinking that I have not given sufficient weight to the eclipse of 1605. (pp. 246–47.) BUTLER: Is there any event, except the Armada, that occurred during Sh.'s youth, to which [the picture of suspense sketched in this sonnet] will apply with anything like the same force and accuracy? I may even go further, and ask whether

there is any event between 1585 and 1609, to which the sonnet can apply without both doing violence to the most natural meaning of its words, and arbitrarily dating it many years later than the other sonnets? We can see how great a scare had been caused by the Armada from the thanksgiving prayer that was read in all churches after it had been defeated. . . . The enemy had intended "to destroy us, our cities, towns, countries and peoples, and utterly to root out the memory of our nation from off the earth for ever." . . . If this is a true picture Sh. might well sketch the general apprehension in such a telling touch as "the prophetic soul of the wide world dreaming on things to come," and might well suppose that the lease of his true love for Mr. W. H. was to expire very shortly. But as there is no other such sketch, so neither is any such picture to be found, in prayer nor elsewhere, of any event between 1585 and 1609. [As to Lee's claim that similar alarm was felt regarding the death of the Queen,] he has not quoted, nor have I been able to find, anything written before the accession of James, which suggests any such grave alarm as was felt all over England when the Armada was off Plymouth, or in sight of Dover. (pp. 104, 106.) CREIGHTON [supports Tyler's view:] There had been a notable eclipse the year before [the Essex rebellion], on which Woodhouse's Almanack for 1601 based a prognostication that its influence would be felt in the state from 20th Jan. 1601 until November. When the rebellion of Essex took place, the populace were so impressed by Woodhouse's prophecy that the Government thought it necessary to call in the copies of the paltry book. There was no other event in Elizabeth's reign which threatened her in the same way. . . . Sh.'s "own fears," for his liberty "supposed as forfeit to a confined doom," are explained by [the performance of *Richard II* on the Thursday or Friday before.] (*Blackwood's*, 169: 676.) BEECHING [accepts the view that there is a reference to the death of the Queen, but disbelieves Lee's view as to the matter of Southampton's release:] If this sonnet were really an ode of congratulation under such circumstances, Southampton in turn could hardly have congratulated the poet on the fervour of his feelings. For there is no reference in the sonnet to any release from prison, and its crowning thought is the familiar one, that the friend will survive in Sh.'s verse, not that he has obtained a new and unexpected resurrection to life. [Lee's paraphrase of the opening quatrain is one it will not bear.] The words "my true love" might certainly by themselves be taken, as Mr. Lee takes them, to mean "my true friend," but "the lease of my true love" can only mean "the lease of my true affection for my friend." All leases are for a term of years; each has a limit or "confine" assigned to it, on which day of doom it expires. Sh. says that neither his own fears nor the world's prophecies of disastrous changes have justified themselves, for in the year of grace 1603 he finds his affection fresher than ever. But to the friends of Southampton the death of Elizabeth would have been an occasion not of foreboding but of hope. (Intro., pp. xxxiii-iv.) . . . The fears and prophecies of line 1 must be interpreted by what follows as fears and auguries of some anticipated future which would be the doom of the poet's love. In the first quatrain the fears are stated in the most general terms as

fears for the future; but the second quatrain connects them with some particular crisis, which came without bringing the expected catastrophe. Instead of that it brought a happier era. Apparently the crisis feared was a civil war in which the arts would perish, since "peace" is referred to as its opposite; and the immediate result anticipated by the poet is the survival of his poems. [ROLFE is disposed to favor the theory of the Essex rebellion, which is also accepted by BRANDES (*William Sh.*, 1: 319). On the other hand, MACKAIL (*Lect. on Poetry*, p. 185) and BRANDL (p. xx) follow the interpretation of Lee; the latter calling attention to the fact that in *Henry V* Sh. showed an eagerness for the union of Scotland with England, and finding here further evidence of his zeal for a "greater Britain." H. PEMBERTON (*New Shakespeareana*, 7: 105) supports the theory favoring 1601, believing that the "sad augurs" refer (as does *Haml.*, I, i, 121–25) to the early winter of that year, when, between November 29 and Christmas, there were notable storms, an earthquake, and eclipses of both moon and sun. But these major theories do not exhaust the possibilities. PALGRAVE supposes that the sonnet refers to the peace of 1609, which ended the war between Spain and the United Provinces; FLEAY (*Biog. Chron.*, 2: 211) that it "can hardly be made to fit with any date but that of the Peace of Vervins," April 1598, a view followed by GOLLANCZ (Intro., p. xix), who emphasizes the "incertainties" which England had suffered during the time she was aiding Henry IV; and Mrs. STOPES finds evidence of the year 1596, when the Queen was restored to health after a period of indisposition which had caused grave anxiety, and when the league with Henry IV may have suggested the olives of peace.]

On the other hand, a few commentators suspect all these interpretations relating to contemporary events. SIMPSON: The sonnet fits into its place much better when . . . interpreted, not of special facts, but of the general circumstances of love. Not his own fears (of death ending all love) nor the "divining eyes" of the old poets mentioned in S. 106, . . . can set a definite term to his love, which had been supposed to be doomed to come to an end. (p. 79.) DOWDEN [agrees with this, interpreting:] "Not my own fears (that my friend's beauty may be on the wane, 104, 9–14), nor the prophetic soul of the world, prophesying in the persons of dead knights and ladies your perfections (S. 106), and so prefiguring your death (or, possibly, divining other future perfections higher than yours), can confine my lease of love to a brief term of years. Darkness and fears are past, the augurs of ill find their predictions falsified, doubts are over, peace has come in place of strife; the love in my heart is fresh and young (see 108, 9), and I have conquered Death, for in this verse we both shall find life in the memories of men." LUCE: [There is no need to look for historic allusions; the lines may mean:] "I myself feared that love could not last; and such was the doubting or the sneering forecast of my friends; but neither I nor they knew the abiding power of love; the love which we doomed to death has suffered only a short eclipse, and the dismal augurs have put themselves to shame." (*Handbook*, p. 93.)

1. **prophetick soule.** STEEVENS: Cf. *Haml.*, I, v, 40: "Oh, my prophetic soul!"

1–2. TYLER: With this passage, which is very important in relation to Sh.'s theology, cf. *R. 3*, II, iii, 41–44:

> Before the days of change, still is it so.
> By a divine instinct men's minds mistrust
> Ensuing danger; as, by proof, we see
> The water swell before a boisterous storm.

Brierre de Boismont says, in his work *Des Hallucinations*, ed. 1862, p. 43: "Il existe dans les masses populaires un instinct politique qui leur fait pressentir les catastrophes des sociétés, comme un instinct naturel annonce d'avance aux animaux l'approche des bouleversements physiques." . . . [The doctrine of the *anima mundi*, the soul of the world, was] prominent in the teaching of Giordano Bruno, who suffered martyrdom in the year 1600, that is, a little before S. 107 was written. Moreover, Bruno had been in England between 1583 and 1585, and had come into contact with Sir Philip Sidney, William Herbert's uncle, so that an allusion to Bruno's doctrine is in no way unaccountable. (In the *Jahrb.*, 11: 91, there is an article by W. König on "Sh. and Giordano Bruno." The writer of this article, after adducing various instances in Sh. of analogy with Bruno's doctrines of greater or less probability, strangely denies that there is any point of connection between Sh. and Bruno's doctrine of an all-pervading world-soul: "His belief soon manifests itself in a certain divine intoxication [*Gotttrunkenheit*], and a kind of pantheism, where he assumes an all-penetrating World-Soul. In this whole region there does not appear in Sh. the slightest connection with Bruno." Had the writer of this article never read S. 107?) There is also another contemporary of Sh. who should here be mentioned, Tommaso Campanella, who entertained opinions similar to those of Bruno with regard to the world as an animated being. [See his sonnet on "The World as an Animal," translated by J. A. Symonds.] (Intro., p. 107.) [Mrs. STOPES also emphasizes the connection between this passage and the philosophy of Bruno; and, in *Sh.'s Warwickshire Contemporaries* (1907), p. 9, suggests a link between Sh. and Bruno's writings in the printer Richard Field, originally of Stratford-on-Avon, who was for a time in the shop of Vautrollier, Bruno's English publisher. "In Vautrollier's shop the sayings of Bruno would acquire tragic interest at his death for a philosophic faith." See also ELTON'S essay on "Giordano Bruno in England," where the influence of Bruno on Sh. is denied. (*Modern Studies*, pp. 26–27.)]

2. BEECHING: The prophecy of things to come must probably be taken, with Wyndham, "as implying that they are to come in place of the things that are." Only, as Sh. always uses "prophetic" in a true sense, I should rather say the implication is that the "things to come" *usually* come in place of things that are. It is this usual implication that the poet denies.

[On lines 3–4 see the notes above, introductory to the sonnet.]

5. **eclipse indur'de.** See also the notes above, where it appears that this

phrase is important in connection with the supposed allusion to the death of Elizabeth. MASSEY: This luminary shone in the human or mortal sphere — was subject to mortality. Just in the same vein, he calls the eyes of Lucrece "mortal stars"; Valeria, in *Coriolanus*, is called the "moon of Rome"; and Cleopatra is spoken of by Antony as our "terrene moon." The Queen was the earthly or *mortal* moon. (p. 215.) DOWDEN: Cf. *A. & C.*, III, xiii, 153: "Alack, our terrene moon is now eclipsed." But an earlier reference to a moon-eclipse (35, 3) has to do with his friend, not with Elizabeth, and in the present sonnet the moon is imagined as having endured her eclipse, and come out none the less bright. TYLER: It may be readily conceded that "the mortal moon" is in all probability a poetical designation of the Queen. She was, according to Elizabethan poets, Cynthia, goddess of the shining orb. But to suppose an allusion to her death seems altogether out of harmony with the drift and scope of the sonnet. Notwithstanding fears and forebodings, the poet's love for his friend shall *not* be "forfeit to a confin'd doom," but shall ever *endure*. In line 5 the emphasis is obviously on the word "endur'd." (Intro., p. 23.) BUTLER: To me the sonnet suggests that [the Queen] not only was not dead, but had emerged from a time of apparent peril with splendour all undimmed. (p. 105.) BEECHING, [recalling Lee's statement that the writers of the time typified the Queen's death as the eclipse of a heavenly body, says:] This interpretation is confirmed by the passage in *A. & C.* . . . An examination of passages will show that an eclipse in Sh.'s metaphorical use means a final, not a temporary, extinction. [See, besides the *A. & C.* passage, *1 H. 6*, IV, v, 53: "Born to eclipse thy life this afternoon."] It is not easy to see by what other metaphor the death of a "moon" could be described. [I do not see that it is possible to be dogmatic about the meaning of this passage. The impression it produces on me is the same as on Dowden and Tyler, viz., that the eclipse has been *passed through;* but it must be admitted that there is ample parallel in Sh. for the use of "endure" in the sense merely "to suffer"; e.g., *R. 2*, V, v, 30:

> Bearing their own misfortunes on the back
> Of such as have before endur'd the like:

and *Lear*, III, vii, 60: "Such a storm as his bare head in hell-black night endur'd." In other words, without knowing who or what the "mortal moon" is, we cannot say whether the thought is, "She has passed through her eclipse, and therefore the augurs laugh at their warnings," or, "She has suffered eclipse, and in spite of this the augurs laugh." But *a priori*, the former seems more natural. — ED.]

10. **My love.** DOWDEN: I am not sure whether this means "the love in my heart," or "my love," my friend. Cf. 104, 8 and 108, 9. ROLFE: The former seems the more probable. BEECHING: My affection. **subscribes.** MALONE: Acknowledges as a superior.

13–14. Cf. 55, 1–2. [WALSH places S. 55 immediately after 107.]

14. BEECHING: Not improbably a veiled reference to the monument that would be erected to the queen.

MASSEY: [This] I take to be the last of the Southampton sonnets, as they have come to us. Sh.'s warfare with Time and Fortune on his friend's behalf is ended; the victory is won, he has found peace at last. There is a final farewell touch in the concluding iteration of the immortality so often promised. (p. 219.)

PRICE [finds this sonnet to show the largest percentage of foreign diction; it is of the class] in which the movement of imagination is most impeded, the charm of poetry least felt. [Cf., in this respect, S. 125.] (p. 365.)

In the Dobell MS. described at the end of S. 2, — the same containing the pseudo-sonnet headed "Cruel" — is a copy of S. 107. The only variant readings are in lines 12 and 14, which read as follows:

> Whilst he Insults ore dul & sencelesse tribes . . .
> When tombs of brasse & tyrants crests are spent.

108

WHAT's in the braine that Inck may character,
Which hath not figur'd to thee my true spirit,
What's new to speake, what now to register,
That may expresse my loue, or thy deare merit?
Nothing sweet boy, but yet like prayers diuine,
I must each day say ore the very same,
Counting no old thing old, thou mine, I thine,
Euen as when first I hallowed thy faire name.
So that eternall loue in loues fresh case,
Waighes not the dust and iniury of age,
Nor giues to necessary wrinckles place,
But makes antiquitie for aye his page,
Finding the first conceit of loue there bred,
Where time and outward forme would shew it dead,

2. **spirit,**] *spirit?* G, etc.

3. **new . . . now**] *new . . . new* M, Kt, Del, Dy, Sta, Gl, Wh, Cam, Do, Hu², R, Ox, But, Her, Be, N, Bull; *now . . . now* Walker conf., Co³.

5. **sweet boy**] *sweet-love* 1640; *sweet love* G, S, E.

8. **Euen**] *E'en* S, E.

10. **iniury**] *injuries* 1640, G, S, E.

---

3. **now to register.** MALONE: The Q here is manifestly erroneous. BOSWELL: Why manifestly erroneous? "What can I say now more than I have said already in your praise?" TYLER: Possibly a misprint for "new." WYNDHAM:

There are two ideas: (1) What *new* thing can be said, which has not been said; (2) What can be said *now*, to-day, when I am taking up my pen again. [The textual notes show that the great body of editors, though disdaining to discuss the matter, agree with Malone. — ED.]

5. **sweet boy.** [By no means an unique expression in Elizabethan literature. Cf., for example, as Mr. HORACE DAVIS notes, Lyly's *Midas*, I, i, "My sweet boy, all is gold," addressed to Mellacrites, "a gentleman of the court"; and Greene's similar address, either to Lodge or Nash, in *A Groatsworth of Wit* (see *Works of Greene and Peele*, ed. Dyce, Intro., p. 60.)]

7–8. WYNDHAM: Cf. 102, 5–6. This was some three years earlier (104), and even then the poet had touched this theme tentatively: then, as now, given the identity of himself with his friend, "Thou mine, I thine," he counted "no old thing old" [cf. 62, 13–14]. The primary sense begins at this point to be doubled by a larger philosophic sense. The obvious meaning — that neither the poet's "songs and praises," though "all alike" (105), nor the beauty of the friend, though it "steals away," can ever be old (104) — is stated in terms so wide as to embrace a mystical suggestion that this, which is true of the friend's beauty and of the poet's devotion, is also true universally. . . . This sonnet is an integral part of the whole "satire to decay" (100–125), the machinery of which consists in a retrospect over the inward moods and outward chances that have befallen to the poet and the friend during three years. But these actual experiences serve for texts to an esoteric doctrine which affirms the eternity of Love and denies the reality of Time.

8. [NEIL (*Ath.*, Apr. 27, 1867, p. 552) finds here a suggestion that this sonnet was addressed to the poet's son Hamnet; in which he is followed by GOEDEKE (*Rundschau*, 10: 407). If this be ingenious, it pales before the suggestion of Mrs. STOPES that the word "hallowed" alludes to the first time the friend was addressed as "Hal," or that of W. UNDERHILL (*N. & Q.*, 7th s., 9: 227), who regards it as a pun on the name of a supposed W. Hall. The use of the word is due, of course, to the figure of the liturgy in lines 6–7. "Every morning since I began to worship you I have continued to say, 'Hallowed be *thy* name.'" — ED.]

9. **case.** MALONE: By the case of love the poet means his own compositions. SCHMIDT: Cause. DOWDEN: Love's new condition and circumstances, the new youth of love spoken of in 107, 10. TYLER: A new position, [due to some change in the appearance of the beloved one.] WYNDHAM: Eternal love, in "love's fresh case," as differentiated by accident, is unaffected by age; [by which I suppose is meant "in each fresh situation." — ED.] BEECHING: Such is love's fresh case, its state of always being fresh. [This interpretation of Beeching's I think is undoubtedly right; cf. "fresh" in 107, 10, where the word means, not new, but as good as new. Schmidt gives numerous instances of "case" in the meaning of state or condition. — ED.]

12. [Here the meanings of both "antiquity" and "page" are rather curiously disputed. SCHMIDT defines the former as "old age," (cf. 62, 10); TYLER, as "the appearance of the beloved one in that olden time when the attachment

commenced," followed substantially by ROLFE; WYNDHAM, "the praise of ladies dead and lovely knights" by the "antique pen" of earlier generations. Schmidt I think is undoubtedly right; "old age" is the more common Shakespearean meaning, and certainly pertinent to this quatrain. As for "page," TYLER apparently understands it as the page of a book, since he paraphrases "Ever sets before him the appearance," etc.; and he is followed by Miss PORTER and Mrs. STOPES, the former commenting, "As of a page in a prayer-book for repetition forever," the latter, "Puts the mark in Life's book, at the old story of first love." I understand WYNDHAM to take the same view, though he does not make it perfectly clear. On the other hand, BEECHING, in paraphrasing, "Love . . . never sees the workings of antiquity, which is always in its rear," seems to imply the image of a page following in the train of Love; (here, unfortunately, one cannot be certain just what is understood by "antiquity"). It argues against the former interpretation that Sh., despite his abundant mention of books, never (unless here) uses the word "page" in that connection, but always "leaf"; with the meaning "servant," on the other hand, it is very familiar. I believe, therefore, that the line means simply, "makes old age his servant," instead of yielding it the mastery; for the use of "page" with the special implication of inferior, cf. *M.V.*, II, i, 35: "So is Alcides beaten by his page." Some of the misreadings of the line are apparently due to the disposition to connect it too closely with the following couplet, which sums up the whole theme, as commonly, "there" referring, not backward, but forward to "Where." — ED.]

13–14. DOWDEN: Finding the first conception of love, i.e., love as passionate as at first, excited by one whose years and outward form show the effects of age. [One might find a commentary on this couplet in Tennyson's dedication of his last volume to his wife, —

> This and my love together,
> To you that are seventy-seven. — ED.]

BUTLER [finds here definite allusion to the fading beauty of the friend; see his note on 100, 10–11. WYNDHAM, on the other hand, is convinced that the poet does not refer to any such change, offering in proof 104, 3].

109

O NEVER say that I was false of heart,
Though absence seem'd my flame to quallifie,
As easie might I from my selfe depart,
As from my soule which in thy brest doth lye:
That is my home of loue, if I haue rang'd,
Like him that trauels I returne againe,
Iust to the time, not with the time exchang'd,
So that my selfe bring water for my staine,
Neuer beleeue though in my nature raign'd,
All frailties that besiege all kindes of blood,
That it could so preposterouslie be stain'd,
To leaue for nothing all thy summe of good:
For nothing this wide Vniuerse I call,
Saue thou my Rose, in it thou art my all.

4. **thy**] *my* G, S, E.
11. **stain'd**] *strain'd* Sta conj., But.
14. **Rose, in it**] *Rose in it,* S[1].

---

2. **absence.** BEECHING: The three years during which the friends did not meet. **quallifie.** SCHMIDT: Moderate, abate.

4. MALONE: Cf. *L. L. L.*, V, ii, 826: "Hence ever then my heart is in thy breast"; and *R. 3*, I, i, 205: "Even so thy breast encloseth my poor heart." TYLER: Cf. S. 24. [Cf. 22, 5–7; 133, 9. — ED.]

5. **my home of love.** ABBOTT: [For "the home of my love." Cf. many similar transpositions. (§ 423.)]

5–6. MALONE: Cf. *M. N. D.*, III, ii, 171–72:

> My heart to her but as guest-wise sojourn'd,
> And now to Helen is it home return'd.

7. DOWDEN: Punctual to the time, not altered with the time. [For the meaning of "exchang'd," cf. *M.V.*, II, vi, 35 (Jessica in her boy's disguise): "I am much asham'd of my exchange."] Mr. H. C. Hart suggests to me — overingeniously I think — that Sh. here alludes to the practice, when travel was more dangerous than at present, of "putting out upon return," when if the traveler did not come home true to the time, he had as it were *exchanged* for his journey whatever sum he staked, forfeiting both the principal and the large interest to be paid on a punctual return home, and getting in exchange only

his travels. [The meaning "altered" has become the accepted one for "exchang'd" in this line, though, as ROLFE observes, it is the only instance of this sense in Sh. Jessica's noun "exchange" is a dubious parallel. — ED.]

11–12. BEECHING: The poet's absence was a stain or fault [cf. line 8], but not so preposterous a stain as desertion would have been.

14. **Rose.** [See WYNDHAM'S and others' notes on 1, 2.] MASSEY: I doubt if there be an instance in Sh. of man addressing man as "my rose," and should as soon expect to find "my tulip." The Queen of Richard II speaks of her fair rose withering, and Ophelia of Hamlet as the "rose of the state." But even here it is one sex describing the other. For the rest, the "rose" is the woman-symbol. (p. 28.) ROLFE: It is somewhat peculiarly applied to the person addressed, if that person is a man. Is it certain that this sonnet and the next are to a man?

BRADLEY: It is remarkable . . . that, while the earlier sonnets show much deference, the later show very little, so little that, when the writer, finding that he has pained his young friend by neglecting him, begs to be forgiven, he writes almost, if not quite, as an equal. Read, for example, Sonnets 109, 110, 120, and ask whether it is probable that Sh. is addressing here a great nobleman. (*Oxf. Lect.*, p. 332.)

See HUDSON'S note at the end of S. 97.

110

Alas 'tis true, I haue gone here and there,
And made my selfe a motley to the view,
Gor'd mine own thoughts, sold cheap what is most deare,
Made old offences of affections new.
Most true it is, that I haue lookt on truth
Asconce and strangely: But by all aboue,
These blenches gaue my heart an other youth,
And worse essaies prou'd thee my best of loue,
Now all is done, haue what shall haue no end,
Mine appetite I neuer more will grin'de
On newer proofe, to trie an older friend,
A God in loue, to whom I am confin'd.
Then giue me welcome, next my heauen the best,
Euen to thy pure and most most louing brest.

2. **the**] *thy* G², S², E.
6. **Asconce**] *Ascance* S¹; *Askance* G², S², etc.
8. **worse**] *worst* S², E. **essaies**] *assaies* 1640; *assays* G, S, E.
9. **done,**] *done;* Ty. **haue what**] *save what* Tyr conj., M, A, Co, B, Hu, Kly, Wh¹, Ox, But.
14. **Euen**] *E'en* S¹. **most most**] Hyphened by Sta.

1–2. Henry Reed: When Sh. meditated upon his theatrical profession . . . he breathed out his sense of degradation in [this] beautiful sonnet, of which the tone is a little louder than a sigh and yet not so harsh as a murmur. (*Lectures*, 2: 262.) Shindler: This is generally interpreted to express Sh.'s dislike to the profession of an actor; [but this view] covers only a small part of the meaning. . . . What was far more repugnant to him was that disclosure of his own feelings, that revelation of himself, which could be seen in his plays by those who knew him intimately. He had "gored his own thoughts," and turned his own fresh griefs into dreams of bygone ages. (This seems to be the meaning of line 4.) (*Gent. Mag.*, 272: 77.) Massey: His language is identical with Saul's, when he says, "I have sinned; behold, I have played the fool, and have erred exceedingly." Saul does not mean that he had worn motley. If the speaker had worn the fool's coat of many colours, he would not have been necessarily making a fool of himself. The image is not used in that sense. If he had been playing the fool's part on the stage, it would be Fortune that had made him a motley to the view, not himself. (p. 197.) Tyler: Whether Sh.

had actually played the part of a fool or jester, a "motley" (cf. *A. Y. L.*, II, vii, 12: "I met a fool i' the forest, a motley fool") is perhaps doubtful. The word may be here used figuratively, in accord with what follows. Sh. may have "played the fool" by seeking new acquaintance. J. M. ROBERTSON: It is impossible to put into fewer and fuller words the story, many a year long, of sordid compulsion laid on an artistic nature to turn its own inner life into matter for the stage. . . . It is true that [the actor's calling] is apt to be more humiliating than another to a man's self-respect, if his judgment remain sane and sensitive. (*Sh. & Montaigne*, p. 160.) BEECHING: There is no reference to the poet's profession of player. The sonnet gives the confession of a favourite of society. BRADLEY: Beeching's note . . . seems to be unquestionably right. . . . This applies, I think, to the whole group of sonnets (it begins with 107) in which the poet excuses his neglect of his friend, though there are *also* references to his profession and its effect. (*Oxf. Lect.*, p. 322 n.) PORTER: Even if [the actor's] career underlies the imagery, it is not of himself as a professional artist that the poet is here speaking, but of an impressionable adaptability that has overlain and hidden his genuine feelings, and involved him in false and discreditable positions with relation to his friend. LUCE: [Cf. the complaint of the Muse Thalia, in Spenser's *Tears of the Muses:*

> So am I made the servant of the manie,
> And laughing stocke of all that list to scorne,
> Not honored or cared for of anie;
> But loath'd of losels as a thing forlorne.

(*Handbook*, p. 93.)]

Further on this subject, see notes on S. 111.

3. **Gor'd.** SCHMIDT: Wounded. MALONE: The meaning seems to be, "I have wounded my own thoughts; I have acted contrary to what I knew to be right." BOSWELL: Cf. *Haml.*, V, ii, 261:

> I have a voice and precedent of peace,
> To keep my name ungor'd.

DOWDEN: Cf. *T. & C.*, III, iii, 228:

> I see my reputation is at stake,
> My fame is shrewdly gored.

BEECHING: [Cf. with these passages *T. N.*, III, i, 129:

> Have you not set mine honour at the stake
> And baited it?]

From these passages it is clear that for a man's reputation to be "gored" meant that it was exposed, like a bear at the stake, for common censure. . . . Or perhaps the clause means simply, "I have wounded my own self-respect." STOPES: Spoken his own thoughts on the stage, thus losing his self-respect.

4. DOWDEN: Entered into new friendships and loves, which were transgressions against my old love. TYLER: "Old offences" may possibly be "enduring offences." VERITY: [Perhaps the line means:] prostituted my love — a love so

new, so unknown to other men, so rare — to the old hackneyed purposes and commonplaces of the stage; made capital out of my emotions, turned my passion to account. LEE: Sinned against old friendships by forming new ones. There is some inversion of phraseology here, but the general sense is clear.

5. **truth.** TYLER: May be pretty nearly equivalent to "virtue," though "fidelity" is a not improbable meaning. [See note on 54, 2. — ED.]

6. **strangely.** WALKER: As though it were a stranger. (2: 289.) DOWDEN: In a distant, mistrustful way.

7. **blenches.** SCHMIDT: Inconstancies, aberrations. DOWDEN: Cf. *M. for M.*, IV, v, 5:

> Though sometimes you do blench from this to that,
> As cause doth minister.

9. **have.** MALONE: [This word] appearing to me unintelligible, I have adopted a conjectural reading suggested by Mr. Tyrwhitt. [It is hard to see why the text appeared unintelligible to Malone, or why his obsolescent emendation should reappear in so recent a text as the Oxford (Craig's). — ED.] MASSEY: [Cf. the Spanish proverb, which Sh. appears to render or adapt: "Amor sin fin, no tiene fin" — "Love without end hath no end." (p. 157.)]

12. DOWDEN: This line seems to be a reminiscence of the thoughts expressed in S. 105, and to refer to the First Commandment. ROLFE: I doubt whether there is such a reference.

13. **my heaven.** MASSEY [instances this as proof that the sonnet was addressed to one of the opposite sex, comparing Katharine of King Henry, saying that she had "loved him next heaven," and Antipholus, in *C. of E.*, calling Luciana "my sole earth's heaven." (p. 28.)] SHARP: [Perhaps] an allusion to his mistress. [The phrase has an interest as being almost the only example of conventional piety in the poet's utterances in the Sonnets. — ED.]

13–14. BRANDES: This exactly corresponds to Michael Angelo's . . . desire to "clasp in his yearning arms his heart's loved lord" [addressed to his young friend Cavalieri]. (*William Sh.*, 1: 349.) ROLFE: It is difficult to believe that this is addressed to a man. VON MAUNTZ [also thinks the lines cannot be viewed as addressed to a man, and that this sonnet and the preceding have to do with the return of Sh. to his wife and family.]

GERVINUS: Is it not [in this sonnet] as if Prince Henry were looking back upon his wild days, which were to him a time of trial, blunting the growth of strong passion? . . . Not unfrequently the conjecture has been expressed that Sh. conferred upon Prince Henry many essential qualities of his own nature. If this were decided, we should have a sure and tangible point of connection, uniting his life with his poetry. (*Sh. Commentaries*, p. 469.)

111

O FOR my sake doe you wish fortune chide,
The guiltie goddesse of my harmfull deeds,
That did not better for my life prouide,
Then publick meanes which publick manners breeds.
Thence comes it that my name receiues a brand,
And almost thence my nature is subdu'd
To what it workes in, like the Dyers hand,
Pitty me then, and wish I were renu'de,
Whilst like a willing pacient I will drinke,
Potions of Eysell gainst my strong infection,
No bitternesse that I will bitter thinke,
Nor double pennance to correct correction.
Pittie me then deare friend, and I assure yee,
Euen that your pittie is enough to cure mee.

1. **wish**] *with* G, etc.
2. **harmfull**] *harmlesse* 1640; *harmless* G, S, E. **deeds**] *needs* Wh conj.
4. **manners**] *custom* G².
14. **Euen**] *E'en* S, E.

MALONE: The author seems here to lament his being reduced to the necessity of appearing on the stage, or writing for the theatre. BOSWELL: Is there anything in these words which, read without a preconceived hypothesis, would particularly apply to the public profession of a player or writer for the stage? The troubles and dangers which attend upon public life in general, and the happiness and virtue of retirement, are among the tritest commonplaces of poetry. Nor was such querulous language likely to have proceeded from Sh. Ben Jonson, who was frequently obliged to exhibit before audiences who were incapable of appreciating the depth of his knowledge, the accuracy of his judgment, or the dignity of his moral, might at one time be desirous of quitting "the loathed stage," or Massinger might have murmured at a calling which scarcely procured him a subsistence; but our poet appears, from the commencement to the close of his dramatic career, to have met with uninterrupted success, and would scarcely indulge in such bitter complaints against a profession which was rapidly conducting him to fortune as well as to fame. (Prelim. Remarks, pp. 219–20.) LAMB: Who can read that affecting sonnet of Sh.'s which alludes to his profession as a player, . . . or that other confession, "Alas! 't is true," [etc., S. 110] — who can read these instances of jealous self-

watchfulness in our sweet Sh., and dream of any congeniality between him and one that, by every tradition of him, appears to have been as mere a player as ever existed. [This in allusion to Garrick, and in indignant remonstrance with the notion that he was possessed of a kindred mind with Sh.'s.] (*Essay on the Tragedies of Sh.*) DELIUS [follows Boswell (*Jahrb.*, 1: 49–50) in arguing for the improbability of Sh.'s regarding his profession as a disgrace. So, in his commentary, he observes that lines 3–4] tell us only, in general, that the poet had been drawn into commerce with the world from considerations of a livelihood, and cannot withdraw from this in spite of the wish of his own heart. MASSEY: [That these two sonnets indicate Sh.'s disgust at his player's life] is not fitted to the relationship of poet and patron, and it is quite opposed to all that we learn of Sh.'s character. It is not true that he had gone here, there, and everywhere to make a fool of himself, when he was quietly working for his company. . . . Nor could he with any the least propriety speak of making a fool of himself on the stage, which was the meeting-place of himself and the Earl, the fount of Sh.'s honour, the spring of his good fortune, the known delight of Southampton's leisure. . . . Nor have we ever heard of any "harmful deeds," or doings of Sh., occasioned in consequence of his connection with the stage. Nor do we see how his name could be branded, or "receive a brand," from his connection with the theatre. . . . He had no name apart from the theatre, and the friendships it had brought him. . . . [As to the "public means" of line 4,] it does not seem to have been questioned whether a player of Elizabeth's time would speak of living by "public means," when the highest thing aimed at by the players was private patronage, except where they hoped to become the sworn servants of Royalty. If the Lord Chamberlain's servants were accounted public, it would be in a special sense, not merely because they were players. . . . Even if it had applied, it was an impossible comment for our poet to make on what he had been striving to do. . . . The meaning, as illustrated in the context, is that the speaker has to live in the public eye in a way that is apt to beget public manners. . . . His public is the only public of Sh.'s time, the court circle and public officers of the state. . . . [Cf. *L. L. L.*, I, i, 132: "He shall endure such public shame as the rest of the court shall possibly desire"; *A. Y. L.*, I, iii, 46: "Our public court"; etc.] . . . S. 25 will tell us what Sh. did not consider "public," for he therein expressly says that Fortune has debarred him from *public* honours. (pp. 189–91.) ELZE: [In the Sonnets Sh. bitterly complains of the bad reputation of his calling.] That the stage cast a certain stigma upon those belonging to it has been nowhere more bluntly stated than by John Davies in his *Microcosmos* (1603), in a sonnet which has all the appearance of having been addressed to Sh. and Burbage: "The stage doth stain pure gentle blood," he says, but then immediately adds: "Yet generous ye are in mind and mood." (*William Sh.*, p. 224.) That Sh.'s lament of the lowness of his social position is not a mere fancy, but an involuntary autobiographical sigh, can scarcely be denied when taken in connection with the other circumstances of his life; and the correctness of this supposition is supported by the poet's father having applied for the grant of a coat-of-arms, doubtless at the son's instigation.

(*ibid.*, p. 427.) HALLIWELL-PHILLIPPS: [With respect to the supposition that there is a reference here to a bitter feeling of personal degradation resulting from Sh.'s connection with the stage,] is it conceivable that a man who encouraged a sentiment of this nature, one which must have been accompanied with a distaste and contempt for his profession, would have remained an actor years and years after any real necessity for such a course had expired? By the spring of 1602, at the latest, if not previously, he had acquired a secure and definite competence independently of his emoluments as a dramatist, and yet, eight years afterwards, in 1610, he is discovered playing in company with Burbage and Hemmings at the Blackfriars Theatre. When, in addition to this voluntary long continuance on the boards, we bear in mind the vivid interest in the stage, and in the purity of the acted drama, which is exhibited in the well-known dialogue in *Hamlet*, and that the poet's last wishes included affectionate recollections of three of his fellow-players, it is difficult to believe that he could have nourished a real antipathy to his lower vocation. . . . If there is, amongst the defective records of the poet's life, one feature demanding special respect, it is the unflinching courage with which, notwithstanding his desire for social position, he braved public opinion in favour of a continued adherence to that which he felt was in itself a noble profession. . . . These considerations may suffice to eliminate a personal application from [these] two sonnets. (*Outlines*, 8th ed., 1: 174–75.) C. W. FRANKLYN [discusses this question, *Westm. Rev.*, 132: 348, believing that this sonnet represents a temporary snobbishness in the author's attitude toward the stage. Sh.'s whole later history disproves its being his real opinion.] TYLER: That Sh. should have expressed a dislike for the dramatic profession and its surroundings has been looked upon as scarcely credible, and yet this is a matter on which the Sonnets leave no room for doubt. . . . To Sh. the associations and circumstances of the theatre seemed debasing. And this feeling might well be deepened by intimacy with a young nobleman of so high rank as William Herbert. With the sensitiveness of his poetic nature, Sh. could not but deeply feel his being looked upon as so mean a person that social usage would not allow his dearest friend to recognise the acquaintance in public [cf. S. 36]. (Intro., p. 113.) LEE: That Sh. chafed under some of the conditions of the actor's calling is commonly inferred. . . . [If the self-pity of these sonnets] is to be literally interpreted, it only reflected an evanescent mood. His interest in all that touched the efficiency of his profession was permanently alive. He was a keen critic of actors' elocution, and in *Hamlet* shrewdly denounced their common failings, but clearly and hopefully pointed out the road to improvement. His highest ambitions lay, it is true, elsewhere than in acting, and at an early period of his theatrical career he undertook, with triumphant success, the labours of a playwright. But he pursued the profession of an actor loyally and uninterruptedly until he resigned all connection with the theatre within a few years of his death. (*Life*, pp. 44–45.) WYNDHAM: To say that he could never have slighted his art as an actor, . . . and then to seek for far-fetched and fantastic interpretations, is to evince an ignorance, not only of the obloquy to which actors were then ex-

posed, and of the degradations they had to bear, but also of human nature as we know it even in heroes. Wellington is said to have wept over the carnage at Waterloo; the grossness of his material often infects the artist, and "potter's rot" has its analogue in every profession. This feeling of undeserved degradation is a mood most incident to all who work, whether artists or men of action. (Intro., p. cxiv.) P. E. More [quotes, in illustration of Sh.'s attitude toward his profession, *J. C.*, I, ii, 260–63: "If the tag-rag people did not clap him and hiss him, according as he pleased and displeased them, as they use to do the players in the theatre, I am no true man."] We do not often, while under the spell of Sh.'s magic, consider what it must have meant to so sensitive and self-conscious a nature as his to have been exposed to the outrageous approval and disapproval of an Elizabethan audience. (*Shelburne Essays*, 2: 38.)

2. **guiltie goddesse.** Abbott: [For "goddess guilty" etc.; for similar transpositions, see § 419a.]

4. **publick.** Schmidt: Vulgar. Tyler: Implying vulgar, low, and probably disreputable conduct. Beeching: I do not think, with Schmidt, that the word means "vulgar." It may perhaps mean "no better than ordinary." [He paraphrases the line:] To be dependent upon the public for livelihood begets a popularity-hunting temper.

5. **brand.** Fleay: The branding . . . is simply that produced by satirical writing of severe criticism. [Cf. *Poetaster* (last scene): "I could stamp their foreheads with those deep and public brands" etc.] (*Macm. Mag.*, 31: 441.)

6. **subdu'd.** Beeching: Brought into conformity with. Cf. *Oth.*, I, iii, 251: "My heart's subdued even to the very quality of my lord." [Main notes an echo of the Shakespearean use of the word in *The Cenci*, III, i:

> Utterly lost, subdued even to the hue
> Of that which thou permittest.]

8. **renu'de.** Gervinus: The metamorphosis after which the poet sighs, the renovation of his being, we seem to perceive taking place, from a few intimations, especially in the last group of our sonnets. The renewal after which he aspired may be understood and interpreted in different ways. In his outward career it is very remarkable that, at the period of the origin of these sonnets, we first find Sh. endeavoring to raise himself above his position, to enter the rank of the gentry, and to advance in consideration and esteem by increasing his worldly possessions. . . . But with this self-reliance with regard to his social position, a still more thorough renewal appears to have been linked. In the most different passages of the later sonnets, where a more serious mood has seized him, he glances upon his past conduct with the severity of fresh austerity. [Cf. Gervinus's remark on S. 110.] (*Commentaries*, pp. 466–69.)

10. **Eysell.** Malone: Vinegar is esteemed very efficacious in preventing the communication of the plague and other contagious distempers. Causton [(*Essay on Mr. Singer's "Wormwood"*) discusses at length the word in Sh., as meaning sour vinegar; (cf. *Haml.*, V, i, 299.)] Even as the dyer washes his

hands in acid (eysell) to remove his surface stain, so, bringing the purgation for his own brand, . . . [Sh.] took the "water for his stain" inwardly, by the throat. (pp. 47–48.) J. Q. Adams, Jr., [in a note in *Mod. Lang. Notes*, 29: 2, argues from the use of the word here that S. 111 is contemporary with *Hamlet*.]

12. **correct correction.** Tyler: Complete and perfect the correction of my conduct. [We should, of course, expect that to "correct correction" would be to alter or reverse it; but Tyler is doubtless right in taking this as a kind of "cognate" construction. It may be said to be analogous to "out-Herod Herod." — Ed.]

Henry Reed: This would be sweet language from any lips; but what can be deeper than the pathos of it, when you reflect that it is the grief of one whose wisdom, for more than two centuries, has been reverently quoted by statesmen, philosophers, and divines, whose plots have wound round so many hearts and moistened so many eyes? (*Lectures*, 2: 263.)

Bleibtreu [(*Die Gegenwart*, 75: 395; noted in *Jahrb.*, 46: 215) believes that this sonnet was written by Lord Rutland, while a prisoner in the Tower, deprived of his property, and compelled to earn his bread by ignoble means.]

112

Your loue and pittie doth th'impression fill,
Which vulgar scandall stampt vpon my brow,
For what care I who calles me well or ill,
So you ore-greene my bad, my good alow?
You are my All the world, and I must striue,
To know my shames and praises from your tounge,
None else to me, nor I to none aliue,
That my steel'd sence or changes right or wrong,
In so profound *Abisme* I throw all care
Of others voyces, that my Adders sence,
To cryttick and to flatterer stopped are:
Marke how with my neglect I doe dispence.
You are so strongly in my purpose bred,
That all the world besides me thinkes y'are dead.

1. **th'impression**] *the impression* M, A, Kt, B, Del, Gl, Kly, Cam, Do, R, Wh², Ty, Ox, But, Her, Be, N.

4. **ore-greene**] *o'er-look* G²; *o'er-skreen* S, E; *o'er-grieve* Stee conj.

5. **All the world, and**] *all, the world and* G, S, E; *all-the-world, and* M, A, Kt, Co, B, Del, Hu, Dy, Sta, Cl, Kly, Wh¹, Hal, Ty, Ox, Be, Bull, Wa.

8. **sence**] *sense'* Dy, Sta. **or changes**] *e'er changes* M conj.; *so changes* Kt, conj.; *changes, or* Kly; *or charges* anon. conj. **right**] *right,* C.

10. **sence**] *sense'* Dy, Sta.

14. **besides**] *beside* But; *besides,* Hu¹, Ty, Wa, Tu. **me thinkes y'are**] *me, thinks I'm* S; *me thinks I'm* E; *methinks are* Stee conj., C, M¹, A, Kt, B, Hu, Co², Sta, Gl, Kly, Cam, R, Wh². Ox, But, Her, Be, Bull; *methinks they are* M², Co¹, Wh¹; *methinks they're* Del, Dy, Cl, Hal, Co³, Do; *methinks y'are* Ty; *me thinks you're* N; *methinks, are* Hu, Wa, Tu.

Fleay: [With this whole sonnet, cf. Drayton, *Idea*, S. 47:

> In pride of wit, when high desire of fame
> Gave life and courage to my lab'ring pen, . . .
>
> No public glory vainly I pursue:
> All that I seek is to eternize you.
>
> (*Biog. Chron.*, 2: 229.)]

2. vulgar scandall. Tyler: The great difficulty in the way of supposing that the reference is merely to the stage and acting is presented by the remarkable

language of S. 121, from which it appears that the scandal had some relation to Sh.'s moral character. . . . Sh. does not deny that there was some foundation for the scandal. He pleads, however, that his failings had been exaggerated, and that his accusers were worse than himself. [Tyler goes on to suggest that there may be some connection between these sonnets and the anecdote respecting Sh., Burbage, and a lady-citizen, told in John Manningham's Diary, March 13, 1601–02; and also with the alleged exchange of hostilities between Jonson and Sh., of which there have been thought to be evidences in the *Satiromastix* and *The Return from Parnassus*. He concludes:] It is sufficient . . . that we have evidence that in or about 1601 there was in circulation scandal affecting Sh.'s moral character and connected with the theatre, and also that there was at the same time a theatrical quarrel in which Sh. was supposed to have taken part. It is not at all difficult to understand how, from such elements, scandal and slander may have grown and become intensified to any possible degree. (Intro., pp. 115–21.)

4. **ore-greene.** MALONE: The allusion seems to be either to the practice of covering a bare coarse piece of ground with fresh green-sward, or to that of planting ivy or jessamine to conceal an unsightly building. STEEVENS: I would read "o'er grieve," i.e., . . . compassionate my failings. SCHMIDT: Cover with verdure. MASSEY: Folds up my faults as the green grass hides the grave, or the ivy's embrace conceals the scars of time. (p. 195.) TYLER: Screening it as with leaves. BEECHING: It is not clear what particular metaphor the poet had in mind; perhaps the grassing over of a bare patch. Cf. 68, 11. **alow.** MALONE: Approve. ROLFE: Cf. *Psalms*, 11: 6 (Prayer Book version): "The Lord alloweth the righteous."

7–8. STEEVENS: The meaning of this purblind and obscure stuff seems to be: "You are the only person who has power to change my stubborn resolution, either to what is right or to what is wrong." DOWDEN: No one living for me except you, nor I alive to any, who can change my feelings fixed as steel either for good or ill (either to pleasure or pain). CARTWRIGHT: [Line 8 may mean:] "Whatever I do, I am always in the wrong, therefore my steel'd sense (. . . his indignant feelings) will make no change, no difference between right or wrong towards others. (p. 33.) HERFORD [paraphrases "or changes right or wrong":] accepts criticism from just or unjust. BEECHING: So far as I am concerned, there is no one but you alive in all the world by whom my resolute mind can be changed to right or wrong. Perhaps we should read "charges"; in that case the paraphrase would be, There is none but you from whom my mind receives charges of right or wrong. LEE: Nobody else is anything to me nor I anything to anybody else who is likely to endow my hardened sensibility or my vacillations of temper with any sense of right or wrong. [I doubt if any one has bettered Steevens's reading. — ED.]

8. **sence.** MALONE: Here used for "senses." DYCE: Evidently a plural, as in the next line but one. Cf. *Macb.*, V, i, 29: "Their sense are shut."

10. **Adders.** MALONE: Cf. *T. & C.*, II, ii, 172: "Ears more deaf than adders." **sence.** ABBOTT: The plural and possessive cases of nouns in which

the singular ends in *s*, *se*, *ss*, *ce*, and *ge*, are frequently written, and still more frequently pronounced, without the additional syllable. (§ 471.)

13. SCHMIDT: You are so kept and harboured in my thoughts. [Cf. also notes on line 14.]

14. STEEVENS [following Malone's emendation:] I proceed as if the world, yourself excepted, were no more. MALONE: "Y'are" was, I suppose, an abbreviation for "they are" or "th' are." TYLER [keeping the Q text:] The poet turns and addresses the world. Cf. 104, 13–14. WYNDHAM: Why was the [emendation] made? Not . . . to make sense of a passage which, as printed in Q, is nonsense; but because the emendators reject the sense which it bears, when so printed, as improbable. That sense is unexpected, even startling: Every one except myself thinks that you are dead. Is it impossible that Sh. should have meant this? If not impossible, the alterations in the text, unrewarded by any signal addition to the meaning of the sonnet, can hardly be defended. Now the couplet, as emended, adds nothing to the meaning: it merely repeats one half of the meaning of line 7, "none else to me . . . alive." That, indeed, was the evident object of Malone's emendation: having rejected the sense of the couplet as it stood, he altered it to suit the sense of the second quatrain. Sh. has some weak couplets, but none which merely repeats — or, as here, repeats less completely — an idea already completely set forth. And he can scarce have echoed the second quatrain feebly after a third quatrain intervening with a strong *crescendo* of emphasis. . . . He creates an expectation of some startling declaration. In Q we get one. Not only is the friend "all the world" to the poet — every one else dead to the poet and he dead to every one — but (and he begs us to "mark how" he dispenses with his neglect at the hands of the world) the friend is so in his "purpose bred" (= so thoroughly kneaded into the intention of his being) that he too shares the poet's case: him also the world holds for dead. The sonnet is hyperbolical throughout, and its *crescendo* movement prepares us for a last extravagance of hyperbole. Is this, the straightforward meaning of Q, too startling? I think not. [This ingeniously labored argument is sufficiently answered by BEECHING, who observes that in keeping the Q text we get not only "a startling declaration," but] a statement which in no way excuses Sh.'s neglect of other critics or flatterers, as it professes to do. And it is not the fact that line 14 as amended merely repeats line 7. That said simply, "There is no one alive but you who can move me"; this says, "there is no one alive but you," — a climax, and a sufficiently "startling declaration." PORTER [again keeping the Q text:] You are so strongly *bred*, i.e., astir and quick, so alive within my settled mind, that, in comparison with what I think you are, all the world, besides me, thinks you are dead. . . . He who is so actually alive in the world's esteem, is dead to every one compared to what he is to the poet.

113

SINCE I left you, mine eye is in my minde,
And that which gouernes me to goe about,
Doth part his function, and is partly blind,
Seemes seeing, but effectually is out:
For it no forme deliuers to the heart
Of bird, of flowre, or shape which it doth lack,
Of his quick obiects hath the minde no part,
Nor his owne vision houlds what it doth catch:
For if it see the rud'st or gentlest sight,
The most sweet-fauor or deformedst creature,
The mountaine, or the sea, the day, or night:
The Croe, or Doue, it shapes them to your feature.
Incapable of more repleat, with you,
My most true minde thus maketh mine vntrue.

1. **left**] *felt* Godwin conj.

6. **bird, of**] *birds, or* 1640, G, S, E. **flowre**] *flowers* S^1, E. **lack**] *latch* C, M^2, etc.

8. **catch**] *take* G^2.

10. **sweet-fauor**] *sweet favour* 1640, G, etc.; *sweet-favour'd* Del conj.

13. **more repleat,**] *more, repleat* G^1, S^1; *more, replete* G^2, S^2, etc.

14. **My**] *Thy* M conj. [with the rest of the line unchanged]. **maketh mine**] *makes mine eye* C, M conj., Gl, R, Her; *maketh my eyne* Co conj.; *maketh m'eye* Cartwright; *mak'th mine eye* Lettsom conj.; *maketh mind* Wh^2; *maketh mine eye* Kly, N.

ISAAC [groups this and S. 114 with the other absence sonnets, 27–28, 43–45, 48, 50–51, 61, believing them all to have been addressed to a lady. Following Simpson, he emphasizes the Renaissance Platonism of the theme — the *idea* of love in absence, as distinguished from eye-love in the presence of beauty; and compares a sonnet of Michelangelo's in which divine love answers the poet's question whether his lady is really as beautiful as she seems to him, another of Petrarch's (Pt. i, S. 124), and Spenser's 87th:

> Of which beholding the Idea plain,
> Through contemplation of my purest part,
> With light thereof I do myself sustain,
> And thereon feed my love-affamish'd heart.

(*Archiv*, 61: 419–23.)]

1. TYLER: Cf. 47, 7–8. BEECHING: It is not clear whether "Since I left you" refers to a new and particular absence, or to the long interval of separation.

3. **part his function.** MALONE: Partly performs his office. [Better, "its office," since the pronoun is doubtless neuter; cf. line 5. — ED.] DOWDEN: Divide its function. HUDSON: [The context requires the meaning,] depart from or forsake his function. ROLFE: "Partly" confirms the [meaning "divide"]. WYNDHAM: Perhaps, "share his function with the mind"; but more probably, depart, abandon. Cf. *R. 2*, III, i, 3: "Your souls must part your bodies." BEECHING: Performs only part of its function. LEE: Forsake. PORTER: A play on the different shade of sense and the similar sound of "part," in the Elizabethan sense of "depart from," . . . and a divided sharing of the functions of eye and mind.

5–6. LEE: Cf. S. 53. These lines expand Petrarch's beautiful Canzone 15, headed "In ogni cosa trova il Poeta l'imagine di Laura," where the poet detects his mistress's form in every aspect of nature.

6. **lack.** MALONE: The corresponding rhyme shows that what I have now substituted was the author's word. To *latch* formerly signified "to lay hold of." Cf. *Macb.*, IV, iii, 195:

> I have words
> That would be howl'd out in the desert air,
> Where hearing should not latch them.

10. **favor.** SCHMIDT: Features, countenance.

14. **mine untrue.** MALONE: I once suspected that Sh. wrote "mine eye untrue," or, "Thy most true mind thus maketh mine untrue." But the text is undoubtedly right. The word "untrue" is used as a substantive. "The sincerity of my affection is the cause of my untruth," i.e., of my not seeing objects truly, such as they appear to the rest of mankind. [Cf. *M. for M.*, II, iv, 170: "My false o'erweighs your true"; *K.J.*, II, i, 101: "This little abstract doth contain that large."] COLLIER: Possibly we ought to read "my eyne," the printer having composed the word from his ear. . . . [But as Malone's interpretation] renders an alteration of the ancient text needless, we hesitatingly adopt it. WHITE [in his 1st edition, keeping the Q text:] The semblance, the fictitious (and so the false or untrue) object which is constantly before me. [In his second edition, adopting "mind":] The correction of a slight and easily made typographical error restores a natural sense, and gives an antithetical conceit which is quite in Sh.'s manner, and which is in keeping with the continuation of the thought in the next sonnet. B. NICHOLSON [(*Ath.*, Feb. 3, 1883, p. 150) proposes to read "mine" as = *mien;* i.e., the Anglo-French *mine*, glossed by Cotgrave as "favour, feature, outward face." Sh. then says, "My mind, most true to you, makes the feature of any other thing presented to it an untrue show, or an appearance untrue to itself." He finds an equivoque of both senses of the word in 134, 3, and in the *Phœnix & Turtle*, line 36: "Either was the other's mine." In this interpretation of "mine," Nicholson had been anticipated by TSCHISCHWITZ, in his translation of 1870.]

TYLER: A tempting emendation has been suggested — "mind untrue." But the sense required would rather seem to be that the mind makes the eyes untrue. It is not easy to suppose that "mine" was originally "m' eyen," equivalent to "my eyes," and pronounced as one syllable. It is perhaps, on the whole, best, even if this view be not quite unobjectionable, to take "untrue" as a substantive, and to take as the meaning that the poet's mind, true to his friend, causes his untruthfulness, — causes him to be untruthful to the actual objects around him. WYNDHAM: "Untrue" is a substantive. . . . But there is also a phonetic suggestion of "mine" = m' eyne = my eyes. [This is a particularly fantastic application of Wyndham's curious belief that Sh. was in the habit of meaning two or three quite different things at the same time. — ED.] BUTLER [paraphrases the line:] The untruthfulness of my perceptions is caused by the truthfulness of my affection for you. BEECHING [also follows Malone's interpretation.] WALSH: Probably the correct reading for "mine" is "m' eyne" (my eyes). LEE: "Untrue" may possibly be used like a noun for "untruth," "deception." "Fair" is repeatedly, and "true" and "false" are occasionally, used as substantives. . . . Modern editors usually substitute "mine eye untrue," which seems a permissible change. Cf. 114, 3: "mine eye saith true," and 104, 12: "mine eye may be deceived." For the like ambiguity in similar context between "mine" and "mine eye" see *T. G. V.*, II, iv, 196, [which reads "Is it mine, or Valentines praise," but for which Warburton's reading has been commonly accepted: "Is it mine eye, or Valentinus' praise."] [The usual defense of the Q text seems to me very lame. Malone's parallel from *M. for M.*, frequently repeated after him, is no real analogue, for the speech there means "My false utterance outweighs your true utterance," and it is this sort of use of adjective for noun which is of course familiar enough. In the present line such a use would require that we understand "mind," the noun just used after "true," to be meant after "untrue," — "My true mind makes my mind untrue" (and this is a possible meaning, if not a probable one). Again, it does not seem to have been sufficiently considered that, even if to understand "untrue" as "untruthfulness" were natural, the statement "My true mind makes my untruthfulness" would still be difficult enough. On the other hand, the emendation "mine eye" is readily defensible: (1) It provides exactly the needed correspondence with line 1; (2) the word "eye" may be thought to have been dropped out either from a "reading by the ear," as was suggested by Collier, or from the natural error of a copyist who had just ended a word with the letter "e"; (3) if "maketh" was in the original text, its dissyllabic character would prevent the omission of the word "eye" from being brought to attention, or, if we prefer to suppose that "makes" was first written, the loss would naturally lead to its being changed to the dissyllabic form; (4) the apparently parallel error in the text of *T. G. V.* gives support to the plausibility of the assumed error here. — ED.]

114

Or whether doth my minde being crown'd with you
Drinke vp the monarks plague this flattery?
Or whether shall I say mine eie saith true,
And that your loue taught it this *Alcumie?*
To make of monsters, and things indigest,
Such cherubines as your sweet selfe resemble,
Creating euery bad a perfect best
As fast as obiects to his beames assemble:
Oh tis the first, tis flatry in my seeing,
And my great minde most kingly drinkes it vp,
Mine eie well knowes what with his gust is greeing,
And to his pallat doth prepare the cup.
If it be poison'd, tis the lesser sinne,
That mine eye loues it and doth first beginne.

2. **this**] *his* E.
3. **saith**] *seeth* anon. conj., But.
6. **cherubines**] *cherubims* G², S, E.
10. **most kingly**] *most kindly* 1640, G, S; *kindly* E.
11. **greeing**] *'greeing* G, etc. (except Dy, Hal, R, Bull).

---

1. **Or whether.** ABBOTT: "Whether" is sometimes used after "or" where we should omit one of the two. (§ 136.)

2. MALONE: Cf. *T. & C.*, II, iii, 211: "How his silence drinks up this applause."

5. **indigest.** SCHMIDT: Chaotic, formless. DOWDEN: Cf. *2 H. 6*, V, i, 157:

> Hence, heap of wrath, foul indigested lump,
> As crooked in thy manners as thy shape.

6. **cherubines.** MASSEY: [Cf. Prospero to Miranda: "O, a cherubin thou wast that did preserve me"; Timon of Phryne, "For all her cherubin look."] No man is called a cherubin by Sh. (p. 28.)

9. **flatry in my seeing.** DOWDEN: Cf. *T.N.*, I, v, 328: "Mine eye too great a flatterer for my mind."

10–14. [Was this image of the cup and cup-bearer suggested by the casual phrasing of line 2? It is possible, of course, that it was in mind from the beginning. — ED.]

11. **his gust.** MALONE: The taste of my mind. **greeing.** ROLFE, [printing the form without the sign of abbreviation, remarks that it is also found in

prose. Several examples may be found in *N. E. D.* The only such instance in Sh., however, is in the highly colloquial speech of Old Gobbo (*M. V.*, II, ii, 108). — ED.]

13. STEEVENS: The allusion here is to the tasters to princes.

115

THOSE lines that I before haue writ doe lie,
Euen those that said I could not loue you deerer:
Yet then my iudgement knew no reason why,
My most full flame should afterwards burne cleerer.
But reckening time, whose milliond accidents
Creepe in twixt vowes, and change decrees of Kings,
Tan sacred beautie, blunt the sharp'st intents,
Diuert strong mindes to th' course of altring things:
Alas why fearing of times tiranie,
Might I not then say now I loue you best,
When I was certaine ore in-certainty,
Crowning the present, doubting of the rest:
Loue is a Babe, then might I not say so
To giue full growth to that which still doth grow.

2. **Euen**] *E'en* S, E.
3. **then**] *when* L.
5. **milliond**] *million* G, S, E.
7. **intents**] *intent* Wa [error].
8. **to th'**] *to the* M, Kt, Del, Dy, Sta, Cl, Gl, Kly, Cam, Do, R, Wh², Ty, Ox, But, Her, Be, N; *t' the* Co, Wh¹, Hal.
10. **now . . . best**] Italics by M, A, Co³, Hu²; quoted by Kt, Co¹·², B, Hu¹, Del, Dy, Sta, Cl, Gl, Wh, Hal, Cam, Do, R, etc.
12. **rest:**] *rest?* G, etc.
13. **not**] Italics by Be.
14. **grow.**] *grow?* G, S, E, M, A, Kt, Co, B, Del, Hu, Dy, Sta, Cl, Gl, Kly, Wh, Hal, Cam, Do, R, Ox, Her, N (not Tu).

1–2. GRIFFIN: [These lines evidently have reference] to a non-existent sonnet — or sonnets. . . . Such missing verse might, I think, find a place after 85. (*Eng. Writers*, 11: 327.)

4. **flame.** DOWDEN: Cf. 109, 2.

5. **reckening.** [The loose construction here is connected, as SCHMIDT indicates, with the "fearing" of line 9.] **milliond.** SCHMIDT: Millionfold. [See ABBOTT's note on "mouthed," 77, 6.]

8. MASSEY: The attempt of Essex to create a revolution, or some great change, is unmistakably meant [here.] (p. 213.) [Massey evidently misunderstood the syntax of the line. — ED.] TYLER: Firm resolutions are changed by a change of circumstances. Cf. *Haml.*, III, ii, 210–11:

> This world is not for aye, nor 't is not strange
> That even our loves should with our fortunes change.

11–12. DOWDEN: Cf. 107, 7.

13. **a Babe.** TYLER: The poet may have in view the common representations of Cupid as a child.

14. **grow.** [See textual notes for the punctuation.] WYNDHAM: [A mark of interrogation] defeats the sense of the whole sonnet. The *ictus* or stress on "not," line 13, (cf. the ictus on "then" and "now" in line 10) shows that the couplet refutes the argument of the third quatrain: it is a contradiction, not a reiterated interrogative. [Wyndham here supports a sound contention by partly worthless evidence. The "ictus" proves nothing, as it follows the sense; this Beeching takes care of by printing the word "not" in italics. — ED.] BEECHING: Wyndham has successfully vindicated the Q full stop at the end of the sonnet. [To this one would suppose that ROLFE agrees, as in his 2d edition he paraphrases the last words of line 13, "I ought not to have said so"; his text, however, still shows the interrogation point.]

[116]

LET me not to the marriage of true mindes
Admit impediments, loue is not loue
Which alters when it alteration findes,
Or bends with the remouer to remoue.
O no, it is an euer fixed marke
That lookes on tempests and is neuer shaken;
It is the star to euery wandring barke,
Whose worths vnknowne, although his higth be taken.
Lou's not Times foole, though rosie lips and cheeks
Within his bending sickles compasse come,
Loue alters not with his breefe houres and weekes,
But beares it out euen to the edge of doome:
If this be error and vpon me proued,
I neuer writ, nor no man euer loued.

116. Q reads "119."

8. **worths**] *north's* Walker conj.; *width's* Brae conj.; *orb's* Kinnear conj.

2. **impediments.** DOWDEN: Cf. "Form of Solemnization of Matrimony" in *Book of Common Prayer:* "If any of you know cause or just impediment," etc. BEECHING: A patent reference to the language of the Church of England marriage service. **love is not love.** STEEVENS: Cf. *Lear*, I, i, 241:

> Love 's not love
> When it is mingled with regards that stands
> Aloof from the entire point.

4. **remover to remove.** SCHMIDT [notes that both words are intransitive in meaning; he paraphrases, "remove to seek another love."] DOWDEN: Cf. 25, 13–14. [A comparison which should have saved Dowden from his misinterpretation of the latter passage. — ED.]

5. **fixed marke.** MALONE: Cf. *Cor.*, V, iii, 74: "Like a great sea-mark, standing every flaw."

5–8. WYNDHAM: Cf. Drayton, *Idea*, S. 43:

> So doth the plowman gaze the wandering star,
> And only rest contented with the light;
> That never learn'd what constellations are,
> Beyond the bent of his unknowing sight.

[Wyndham thinks this was "suggested by" Sh.'s sonnet. (p. 257.) He erroneously says that it appeared first in 1619; in fact it was in the *Poems* of 1605. — ED.] LEE [views Shakespeare as, in general, the borrower from Drayton, but without discussing this particular sonnet. (*Life*, p. 110n.) BEECHING (pp. 137–39) supports Wyndham's view:] Sh.'s sonnets were not printed until 1609, and this sonnet of Drayton's appeared in 1605; but for all that, if there has been borrowing (and the idea at a time when planetary influence was still believed in would not have been recondite), I cannot hold with Mr. Fleay and Mr. Lee that the borrower is Sh. If there was borrowing, surely Sh.'s MS. would have been as accessible to Drayton as (according to Mr. Lee) Drayton's was to Sh. However this may be, something very like the same idea, in a passage still more like the passage in Drayton, occurs in *L. L. L.*, I, i, 88–91, the date of which cannot be subsequent to 1598:

> These earthly godfathers of heaven's lights
> That give a name to every fixed star
> Have no more profit of their shining nights
> Than those that walk and wot not what they are.

[ELTON (*Michael Drayton*, 1905, p. 57) is disposed to agree with Beeching. On this matter see further the notes to S. 144, and Appendix, p. 457.]

8. PALGRAVE: Whose stellar influence is unknown, although his angular altitude has been determined. INGLEBY: Human virtue is figured [in *J.C.*, III, i, 60–61] under the "true-fix'd and resting quality" of the northern star. Surely, then, the "worth" spoken of must be *constancy*. . . . The sailor must know that the star has this worth, or his latitude would not depend upon its altitude. (*The Soule Arayed*, p. 5.) [A correspondent of *N. & Q.*, (5th s., 12:

24) signing himself "Bibliothecary," proposes to understand "hight" as from the old verb meaning "promise," etc., though with exactly what significance here he does not make plain. The suggestion led to the two notes that follow.] B. NICHOLSON: One's whereabouts at sea, or at least one's latitude, is ascertained by taking the meridian height of a celestial body. . . . In the *Sta. Reg.* I have seen the entry of a book giving the heights of the stars for the meridian of, I suppose, London. (*N. & Q.*, 6th s., 1: 250.) B. C.: The sailor, in mere routine, may take the altitude of the Pole star with the utmost pains, . . . yet know nothing of its benign influences and occult qualities. (*ibid.*, p. 251.) A. E. BRAE [supports his emendation ("width") by the indisputable fact that it is the direct opposite of "height," and interprets it to mean "horizontal deviation, or azimuth," as in the phrase "to go wide" (of the mark, etc.; cf. 140, 14)]. (*Lippincott's Mag.*, 19: 762.) DOWDEN: Schmidt explains "unknown" here as "inexpressible, incalculable, immense." The passage seems to mean, "As the star, over and above what can be ascertained concerning it for our guidance at sea, has unknowable occult virtue and influence, so love, beside its power of guiding us, has incalculable potencies." This interpretation is confirmed by the next sonnet, in which the simile of sailing at sea is introduced. [Cf. especially 117, 14.] . . . "Height," it should be observed, was used by Elizabethan writers in the sense of value, and the word may be used here in a double sense, *altitude* (of the star) and *value* (of love). KINNEAR: See Hackluyt, *Voyages*, III, 393 (Richardson, *Dict.*): "Where having taken the height of the pole-star, they found themselves to be in 37 degrees and ½ of northerly latitude." (*Cruces*, p. 501.) TYLER [thinks the reference is still to the light-house of line 5; a "star" only figuratively.] VERITY: [Perhaps "worth" may be taken literally:] The height, altitude of the star is known; but who can tell what riches it contains? WYNDHAM: A mystical assertion that, as the unknown worth and occult influence of a star is in excess of the practical service it affords to mariners, so has love an eternal value immeasurably superior to the accidents of time.

9. **Times foole.** MALONE: *1 H. 4*, V, iv, 81: "Thought 's the slave of life, and life time's fool." SCHMIDT: Made a sport of by time. TYLER: Cf. *M. for M.*, III, i, 11: "Thou art Death's fool"; *R. & J.*, III, i, 141: "I am fortune's fool." [Cf. 124, 13. — ED.]

10. **sickles.** Cf. 12, 13; 60, 12; 100, 14; 123, 14; 126, 2.

12. MALONE: Cf. *A.W.*, III, iii, 5–6:

> We'll strive to bear it for your worthy sake
> To the extreme edge of hazard.

HENRY REED: If this sonnet was written before [Sh.'s] dramas, then it was the pregnant thought from which were destined to spring those inimitable creations of female character that have been loved, as if they were living beings, by thousands. If, as is most probable, it was written afterwards, it is Sh.'s own comment, and might be prefixed as a most apposite motto to those dramas in which he has given life and motion to the conception. (*Lectures*, 2: 254.)

GOLLANCZ: No long interval could have separated *R. & J.* and [this sonnet,] the poet's epitaph for the golden tomb raised to the lovers by their loveless kin, — the very epitome of all the songs and stories of romantic passion that we have heard or read. (Intro., p. xii.) HERFORD: [This sonnet] is the intellectual focus of the entire series. (Intro., p. 378.) [In like manner, in my introduction to the Tudor edition, I have called S. 116 the "thematic terminus" of the collection. — ED.]

117

ACCUSE me thus, that I haue scanted all,
Wherein I should your great deserts repay,
Forgot vpon your dearest loue to call,
Whereto al bonds do tie me day by day,
That I haue frequent binne with vnknown mindes,
And giuen to time your owne deare purchas'd right,
That I haue hoysted saile to al the windes
Which should transport me farthest from your sight.
Booke both my wilfulnesse and errors downe,
And on iust proofe surmise, accumilate,
Bring me within the leuel of your frowne,
But shoote not at me in your wakened hate:
Since my appeale saies I did striue to prooue
The constancy and virtue of your loue

6. **time**] *them* Sta conj., But. **deare purchas'd**] Hyphened by S^1, M, etc.
7. **saile**] *sails* G^2, S^2, E.
8. **farthest**] *furthest* Ox.
9. **errors**] *errour* 1640; *error* G, S, E.
10. **proofe surmise,**] *proof, surmise* M, A, B, Ty; *proof surmise* Kt, Co, Del, Hu, Dy, Sta, Cl, Gl, Kly, Wh, Cam, Do, R, Ox, Wy, etc.
13. **I did**] *I did not* B.

WALSH [places this sonnet between 109 and 110, with which it is naturally allied in theme.]

1. **scanted.** SCHMIDT: Afforded sparingly.
4. MALONE: Cf. *R. 2*, IV, i, 76–77:

> There is my bond of faith,
> To tie thee to my strong correction.

5. **frequent.** SCHMIDT: Conversant, intimate. **unknown mindes.** SCHMIDT: Minds such as I should be ashamed to mention. DOWDEN: Persons who may

not be known, or obscure persons. BEECHING: People of no interest or importance. [Cf. *R. 3*, I, ii, 218: "For divers unknown reasons," which Schmidt interprets as "reasons such as I must not tell," but which Beeching takes simply as "insignificant reasons."]

6. **time.** DOWDEN: Society, the world; cf. 70, 6. Or, given away to temporary occasion what is your property and therefore an heirloom for eternity. TYLER [is disposed to favor Staunton's proposed emendation "them."] WYNDHAM: Time is the personified object of the whole argument (1–125), and appears as such in the two preceding sonnets (115, 9 and 116, 9). [See the notes on the same word in 70, 6, especially BEECHING's, for his interpretation here.] PORTER: Those emotions that had only transient worth and temporary claim upon him. **deare purchas'd.** TYLER: Though it is not pleasant to attach a material signification to these words, yet, taking into account what is recorded of Lord Pembroke's liberality towards men of genius, it seems not unlikely that there is an allusion to previous presents.

9–10. BEECHING [cites these lines, and lines 9–10 in the following sonnet, as examples of an "abstract way of writing," characteristic of the period of *T. & C.* (Intro., p. lii.)]

11. **level.** SCHMIDT: Direction [of a weapon.] WYNDHAM: Cf. *L.C.*, 22: "Level'd eyes."

118

LIKE as to make our appetites more keene
With eager compounds we our pallat vrge,
As to preuent our malladies vnseene,
We sicken to shun sicknesse when we purge.
Euen so being full of your nere cloying sweetnesse,
To bitter sawces did I frame my feeding;
And sicke of wel-fare found a kind of meetnesse,
To be diseas'd ere that there was true needing.
Thus pollicie in loue t'anticipate
The ills that were, not grew to faults assured,
And brought to medicine a healthfull state
Which rancke of goodnesse would by ill be cured.
But thence I learne and find the lesson true,
Drugs poyson him that so fell sicke of you.

1. **to make our**] *you make your* G², S², E.

5. **nere cloying**] *neare cloying* 1640; *near cloying* G, S, E; *ne'er-cloying* Th conj., C, M, etc.

7. **meetnesse**] *meekness* G², S², E.

8. **there was true**] *that was truly* G².

9. **t'anticipate**] *to anticipate* C, M, A, Kt, B, Del, Dy, Sta, Cl, Gl, Kly, Cam, Do, R, Ty, Ox, But, Her, Be, N.

10. **were, not**] *were not*, G, etc.

---

2. **eager.** STEEVENS: Sour, tart.

5. **nere cloying.** WALSH: Cf. *A. & C.*, II, ii, 241–43:

> Other women cloy
> The appetites they feed, but she makes hungry
> Where most she satisfies.

5–8. KRAUSS: Cf. Sidney, *Arcadia:*

> Like those sick fellows, in whom strange humours flow,
> Can taste no sweets, the sour only please. . . .
> Bitter griefs taste me best, pain is my ease,
> Sick to the death, still loving my disease.
>
> (*Jahrb.*, 16: 175.)

9. **pollicie.** DOWDEN: Prudent management of affairs.

10. Miss PORTER [alone would keep the comma after "were":] The ills that were . . . did not have the chance to "grow to faults assured."

12. **rancke.** STEEVENS: Cf. *A. & C.*, V, ii, 212: "Rank of gross diet." SCHMIDT: Sick (of hypertrophy).

MASSEY: [With this language of a repentant lover cf. *M. N. D.*, IV, i, 177–79:]

> But like a sickness did I loathe this food;
> But, as in health, come to my natural taste,
> Now I do wish it, love it, long for it.

119

WHAT potions haue I drunke of *Syren* teares
Distil'd from Lymbecks foule as hell within,
Applying feares to hopes, and hopes to feares,
Still loosing when I saw my selfe to win?
What wretched errors hath my heart committed,
Whilst it hath thought it selfe so blessed neuer?
How haue mine eies out of their Spheares bene fitted
In the distraction of this madding feuer?
O benefit of ill, now I find true
That better is, by euil still made better.
And ruin'd loue when it is built anew
Growes fairer then at first, more strong, far greater.
So I returne rebukt to my content,
And gaine by ills thrise more then I haue spent.

1. **potions**] *potion* G².
4. **loosing**] *losing* G, etc.
7. **Spheares**] *sphere* G². **bene fitted**] *been flitted* Lettsom conj., Massey conj.; *e'en flitted* Hu conj.
13. **rebukt**] *rebuke* 1640, G, S, E.
14. **ills**] *ill* M, A, Kt, Co, B, Del, Hu, Dy, Sta, Cl, Gl, Kly, Wh, Hal, Cam, R, Ox, Wy, But, Her, Bull, Wa.

TYLER: It is probable that we are here brought close to the causes of the scandal to which 112 and 121 relate.

1. **Syren.** BEECHING: The siren would seem to be the lady of the sonnets [at the end of the collection.] ROLFE: The wily tears of seductive women.

1–2. LEE: [This exordium] adopts expressions in Barnes's vituperative sonnet (No. 49), where, after denouncing his mistress as a "siren," the poet inco-

herently ejaculates: "From my love's limbeck [have I] still stilled tears!" (*Life*, p. 152n.)

2. **Lymbecks.** SCHMIDT: Alembics, stills. **foule as hell.** TYLER: Cf. 131, 13 and 147, 14.

4. DOWDEN: Either "losing in the very moment of victory," or "gaining victories (of other loves than those of his friend) which were indeed but losses." BEECHING: The contrast of line 5 with line 6 shows that the latter is the more probable sense.

7. **fitted.** MALONE: Convulsed during the frantic fits of my feverous love. [Cf. *Macb.*, III, iv, 21: "Then comes my fit again."] STEEVENS: We meet in *Hamlet* [I, v, 17] the same image as here: "Make thy two eyes, like stars, start from their spheres." STAUNTON: Started, as by paroxysms. [He compares *Per.*, II, i, 58, "If it be a day fits you," apparently understanding "fits" in a cognate sense.] SCHMIDT: Worked by paroxysms. DOWDEN: Started from their hollows in the fever fits of my disease. [The *N. E. D.* accepts this traditional gloss, without noting any parallel.] MASSEY: [This] must, I apprehend, be a misprint for "flitted," the word that, above all others, signified a "moving" or *removal* to the Scotch mind. . . . Cf. Fairfax's Tasso (5, 58): "Alas, that cannot be, for he is flit out of this camp." . . . Puttenham calls the figure *metastasis* the "flitting figure," or the Remove. The meaning of the line is, how have my eyes been moved out of their spheres. Cf. *Cymb.*, V, v, 371: "After this strange starting from your orbs." (p. 185.) HUDSON: I strongly suspect . . . "e'en flitted." This would give us something very like a passage in *Lucrece* [line 461]: "Who, angry that the eyes fly from their lights." WYNDHAM: "Fit" sometimes = a sudden emission. Cf. Coleridge: "A tongue of light, a fit of flame." [Malone's interpretation is supported by a line noted by Mr. HORACE DAVIS, in Barnes's *Parthenophil*, 2d Madrigal: "I for thee fever scorched, yet thou still fitless."]

8. **madding fever.** TYLER: Cf. 147, 1, 9–10.

10. MCCLUMPHA: Cf. *R. & J.*, I, ii, 46–49: "One fire burns out another's burning," etc.

11. DOWDEN: Note the introduction of the metaphor of rebuilt love, reappearing in later sonnets. Cf. *C. of E.*, III, ii, 4: "Shall love, in building, grow so ruinate"; and *A. & C.*, III, ii, 29–30: "The cement of our love, to keep it builded." [These parallels had been noted by MALONE.]

11–12. FURNIVALL: [This doctrine] was also put into Tennyson's *Princess*, in its "Blessings on the falling-out, that all the more endears"; but was rightly taken out again. (Intro., p. lxv.)

14. **ills.** [The alteration to "ill" is defended, by some editors, by a reference to line 9.]

MASSEY: The confession [made in this sonnet] can only have been made to a woman. It would have no meaning from a man to a man. (p. 197.)

120

THAT you were once vnkind be-friends mee now,
And for that sorrow, which I then didde feele,
Needes must I vnder my transgression bow,
Vnlesse my Nerues were brasse or hammered steele.
For if you were by my vnkindnesse shaken
As I by yours, y'haue past a hell of Time,
And I a tyrant haue no leasure taken
To waigh how once I suffered in your crime.
O that our night of wo might haue remembred
My deepest sence, how hard true sorrow hits,
And soone to you, as you to me then tendred
The humble salue, which wounded bosomes fits!
But that your trespasse now becomes a fee,
Mine ransoms yours, and yours must ransome mee.

6. **y'haue**] *you have* C, M, A, Kt, Co, B, Del[1,2], Kly, Wh[1], Hal; *you've* Hu, Dy, Sta, Cl, Gl, Cam, Del[3], Do, R, Wh[2], Ox, But, Her, Be, N.

7. **tyrant**] *truant* Sta conj.

9. **our**] *sour* Sta conj.; *one* or *your* Be conj.

11. **soone**] *shame* Sta conj. **me then**] *me, then* C, M, A, Kt, Co, B, Hu[1], Del, Dy[1], Cl, Gl, Kly, Wh, Hal, Cam, Do, R, Ox, Wy, Her, N, Wa; *me then*, Walker conj., Sta, Dy[2], Hu[2], But, Be, Bull.

12. **bosomes**] *bosom* M[1].

13. **that . . . becomes**] *let . . . become* Massey conj.

Cf. Sonnets 34–35, and note.

1. **once unkind.** WALSH: "Thy unkindness" is mentioned in 139, 2 (where, however, it seems to be general), and "thy trespass" in 35, 6. The present line may refer to one of these, or to the "cloud," in 33 and 34, or to the quarrel in 57 and 58, or to something else.

4. **Nerves.** [In this context it is perhaps prudent to recall that "nerves" for Sh. meant sinews or muscular strength; the physical figure of "bow" is continued. — ED.]

5–6. FURNIVALL: Cf. Coleridge [*Christabel*]:

> And to be wroth with one we love
> Doth work like madness in the brain.
>
> (Intro., p. lxv.)

6. **a hell of Time.** MALONE: Cf. *Oth.*, III, iii, 169–70:

> But O, what damned minutes tells he o'er
> Who dotes, yet doubts, suspects, yet soundly loves!

And *Lucrece*, 1287: "And that deep torture may be call'd a hell."

9. **our night.** TYLER: On that former occasion. The expression "night of woe" may be metaphorical, though it is, of course, possible that reference may be made to some particular night. WYNDHAM: Clearly refers to some one occasion of great sorrow, well-known to the friend and to the poet, which the friend "once" caused by his "crime," but for which he "soon tendered" the fitting salve. BEECHING: [The reading "our"] is impossible, as it spoils the antithesis of "you" and "me," which runs all through the sonnet. Emendation is difficult because it is uncertain whether "that" is demonstrative or conjunctive. I incline to the former supposition, as the effect of the line seems purposely repeated below in line 13, and, if so, we may accept Staunton's conjecture of "sour," or read "one" (from the "once" in the preceding line). If "that" is a conjunction, I can only suggest "your" for "our," and suppose that the poet means, "Would that in some mystical way your night of woe had communicated itself to my deepest (subliminal) sense, and reminded it," etc. ROLFE: Probably metaphorical (that dark and woful time). **remembred.** MALONE: Cf. *R. 2*, III, iv, 14: "It doth remember me the more of sorrow."

10. **deepest sence.** HUDSON: As Hamlet expresses it, "my heart of heart."

11. **me then.** WALKER: Surely the sense requires [the punctuation "me then, tender'd."] [The rhythm is surely more agreeable if one can find it satisfactory to put the comma after "me"; but in 22, 10 we have a similar logical pause after the eleventh syllable. — ED.]

12. **salve.** DOWDEN: Cf. 34, 7.

13. **a fee.** TYLER: Something which I can offer as a payment and ransom for my own offence.

[See BRADLEY's note at the end of S. 109.]

121

Tis better to be vile then vile esteemed,
When not to be, receiues reproach of being,
And the iust pleasure lost, which is so deemed,
Not by our feeling, but by others seeing.
For why should others false adulterat eyes
Giue salutation to my sportiue blood?
Or on my frailties why are frailer spies;
Which in their wils count bad what I think good?
Noe, I am that I am, and they that leuell
At my abuses, reckon vp their owne,
I may be straight though they them-selues be beuel
By their rancke thoughtes, my deedes must not be shown
Vnlesse this generall euill they maintaine,
All men are bad and in their badnesse raigne.

1. **vile esteemed**] Hyphened by Walker conj., Del, Sta, Hu².
3. **pleasure**] *pleasure's* S.
5. **false adulterat**] Hyphened by Walker conj., Sta, Dy², Hu².
14. **All . . . raigne**] Italics by Be. **raigne**] *feign* But.

JORDAN: [This sonnet] seems to me to indicate that already the poet had learned that there were in circulation unworthy suspicions such as the sonnets have frequently aroused among later critics. ISAAC: No one is directly addressed: it is a soliloquy of the poet, in which he makes light of the slanders of evil men and makes himself tranquil. Regarding the nature of the slanders we can reach the general conclusion, from the words "adulterate eyes," that it had some relation to *galanterie*. . . . Our knowledge goes no further. (*Archiv*, 59: 270.) [See TYLER'S note on 112, 2.]

3–4. DOWDEN: And the legitimate pleasure lost, which is deemed vile, nc by us who experience it, but by others who look on and condemn. WYNDHAM: And the lawful pleasure lost, which is judged vile from the point of view of others and not from any sense of shame on our part. BEECHING: The poorer by a pleasure, which is the vileness they mean, though, maybe, we should not so reckon it.

6. **Give salutation.** ISAAC: I believe that we must go back to the old Germanic significance of this verb, which appears in M. H. G. "gruoz" and still in the English "greet" in Sh., i.e., *meet* in an optional sense, either friendly or

hostile; . . . it is the whole character of the meeting, in which is reflected the impression which the one *greeted* has made upon the one *greeting*. . . . [Cf. *T. & C.*, III, iii, 108: "Eye to eye opposed Salutes each other with each other's form"; where there is the same meaning as here, viz., "reflects the impression which has been made on the one saluting," and which in this case is indicated by the word "adulterate."] The translation of Jordan is excellent:

> Des Lüstlings Auge grüsst mit frechem Hohne
> In mir ein ihm verwandtes wildes Blut.
>
> (*Archiv*, 59: 271.)

SCHMIDT: Affect in any manner (gratify or mortify). [Cf. *H. 8*, II, iii, 103: "Would I had no being, if this salute my blood a jot"; and "greet" in *Per.*, IV, iii, 38: "It greets me as an enterprise of kindness."] TYLER: Take account of and criticise. HERFORD: Affect, stir. BEECHING: Affect, stir, and so infect. LEE: Stir (by greeting) or stimulate. [It is evident that the interpretation of the phrase here is largely a matter of guess-work. What we should expect would be something like "pass judgment on" or "interpret in an unfriendly manner"; but neither of these meanings appears to be warranted by what is said. I cannot find the meaning "stir" or "affect" plausible; for it is not a question of the writer's sensual nature being stirred or affected by his critics; still less can I understand Beeching's "infect." Isaac's reading seems really more rational than that of any later commentator, though there is no need to reach the interpretation by so complicated a linguistic process. "Salute," for Sh., commonly meant the giving of an emphatic greeting appropriate to the relations of the persons concerned, — especially that of a king to a subject or the reverse. May it not therefore mean here, "hail as a prince of adultery like themselves," or, perhaps, "as a greater prince"? — a case of the beam saluting the mote. — ED.] **sportive.** TYLER: My somewhat warm nature. ROLFE: Amorous, wanton. [Cf. notes on 95, 6. GILDEMEISTER glosses, "Verzeihliche Temperamentssünden."] Mr. HORACE DAVIS [suggests that the line may mean, "Give my blood the name of sportive (wanton)."]

8. **wils.** ISAAC: Inclinations. [Cf. "ill-will."] (*Archiv*, 59: 271.) DOWDEN: According to their pleasure. LEE: Cf. 57, 13.

9 **I am that I am.** TYLER: With all my frailties, but yet not without something of good. MACKAIL: These words are in effect Sh.'s single and final self-criticism. They are almost appalling in their superb brevity and concentrated [illegible]ht; beside them even the pride of Milton dwindles and grows pale; for [illegible] Sh., for one single revealing moment, speaks not as though he were God's elect, but as though he were God himself. (*Lect. on Poetry*, p. 196.) [One may enjoy this eloquent note, it is to be hoped, without being carried off his feet by it. The context shows that all Sh. says is, "I have an independent standard of character, and when others do not find theirs fitting it, the crookedness (line 11) may be theirs." — ED.] **levell.** SCHMIDT: Aim. [Cf. 117, 11.]

10. **reckon.** WALSH: [Apparently subjunctive,] — "let them reckon." [Most readers, I am sure, take it as indicative, explained by the following line: "their

faults begin to appear for reckoning (enumeration), in their very act of attacking mine." — ED.]

11. **bevel.** STEEVENS: Crooked; a term used only, I believe, by masons and joiners. [The *N. E. D.* gives no other example of its adjective use, with this meaning, earlier than 1677.] WYNDHAM: The sense is rather "oblique" than "crooked."

12. BEECHING: Cf. 69, 10. **rank.** ROLFE: Cf. 69, 12. TYLER: This, as well as preceding expressions, shows that the charge brought against the poet involved sensuality.

14. **raigne.** SCHMIDT: Exult in, are made happy by. [Cf. *R. 3*, IV, iv, 53:

> That excellent grand tyrant of the earth,
> That reigns in galled eyes of weeping souls.]

BUTLER [reading "feign":] I can make no sense of [the Q text.] The sense I take to be, "I am not judged by the rank thoughts of these men, unless, indeed, they are prepared to admit that all men are bad, but pretend to be better than they are." BEECHING: I have marked the whole line [as a quotation] as the theory of the "spies." But the sense of "reign" is not clear. . . . Perhaps it means "what makes 'kings of men' is but a higher degree of badness."

L. A. J. BURGERSDIJK [(*Jahrb.*, 14: 363) interprets this sonnet as an attack on the Puritans:] If one conceives that here the dramatic poet and actor, despised, interfered with, slandered, persecuted, by the Puritans, hurls a sonnet against his bitter foes, everything becomes clear. In this time, he says, gradually dominated by Puritanism, it would be better to be bad, than to belong to a profession defamed as bad. These pious or pietistic people spoiled his pleasure [line 3], which was considered bad by some spectators ("by others' seeing"); the attendants on the theatre, who applauded his humour [line 6], were depraved ("adulterate") in the judgment of these weak spirits. But the poet maintains his position; he believes that the stage is chiefly hated because it holds up a mirror before these people [line 10], and considers itself as *straight* (the exact epithet for the Puritans) as they, — at least unless they are right in their thesis that humanity and all its deeds are evil. . . . [The sonnet would be well placed near S. 29], where doubtless the poet is also speaking of his despised profession. [Burgersdijk's theory is supported and developed by VON MAUNTZ (*Anglia*, 19: 291), who makes a new translation of the sonnet, in which he renders "sportive blood" as *frohnatur*.]

HORACE DAVIS: I am inclined to think the charge against which Sh. defends himself was inconstancy; this is the general subject from 109 to 125. In 109,11, pleading that he was not "false of heart," he speaks of his apparent disloyalty to his friend as his "stain," resulting from his frailties; here he uses the same expression (line 7).

122

TThy guift,, thy tables, are within my braine
Full characterd with lasting memory,
Which shall aboue that idle rancke remaine
Beyond all date euen to eternity.
Or at the least, so long as braine and heart
Haue facultie by nature to subsist,
Til each to raz'd obliuion yeeld his part
Of thee, thy record neuer can be mist:
That poore retention could not so much hold,
Nor need I tallies thy deare loue to skore,
Therefore to giue them from me was I bold,
To trust those tables that receaue thee more,
To keepe an adiunckt to remember thee,
Were to import forgetfulnesse in mee.

2. lasting] *a lasting* G¹, S, E.

TYLER: [A present of tablets] the poet had, probably during the period of separation, given away to some other person — perhaps after writing 99, thinking that the breach was final. VON MAUNTZ [suggests that the tablets may have contained some of the sonnets, and that the reference is to the time when Sh. had allowed them to pass into other hands. (*Gedichte*, p. 152.)] ROLFE: Cf. S. 77, where a similar present to his friend is mentioned. Miss PORTER [takes the tables as allegorical, referring to the personality of the friend, as first presented and impressed upon the poet.] These tables of memory are now, through the psychical effect of ripened love within the poet, transcended by a finer memorial to which the first contributed.

LEE: [The sonnet] repeats something of Ronsard's phraseology; . . . cf. *Amours*, livre 178; *Amours pour Astrée*, 6. The latter opens:

> Il ne falloit, maistresse, autres tablettes
> Pour vous graver que celles de mon cœur
> Où de sa main Amour, nostre vainqueur,
> Vous a gravée et vos grâces parfaites.
>
> (*Life*, p. 112.)

1. **TThy.** The T in ordinary type is repeated after the large initial. **tables.** WALSH: "Tables" appear to have been small note-books with glossy leaves, or tablets, on which notes could temporarily be jotted down and again erased.

[Cf. Bacon, *New Atlantis*, where is mentioned a scroll] "shining like the leaves of writing tables, but otherwise soft and flexible"; . . . *2 H. 4*, IV, i, 201: "Therefore will he wipe his tables clean."

1–2. MALONE: Cf. *Haml.*, I, v, 98–99, 102–03:

> Yea, from the table of my memory
> I'll wipe away all trivial fond records, . . .
> And thy commandment all alone shall live
> Within the book and volume of my brain;

T. G. V., II, vii, 3–4:

> Who art the table wherein all my thoughts
> Are visibly character'd and engrav'd.

3. **idle rancke.** SCHMIDT: Unprofitable degree of dignity. [Cf. 32, 12; 85, 12.] DOWDEN: Poor dignity. BEECHING: Useless series of leaves; [or Dowden may be right.] LEE: The dignity of such humble objects. [For "rank" in the meaning proposed by Beeching, which I am disposed to favor, cf. *A. Y. L.*, IV, iii, 80: "Rank of osiers." — ED.]

9. **poore retention.** MALONE: The table-book, . . . incapable of retaining, or rather of containing, so much as the tablet of the brain.

10. **tallies.** SCHMIDT: Sticks on which notches or scores are cut, to keep accounts by.

[VON MAUNTZ takes this to be the last of the Southampton sonnets, marking the moment of a second and lasting estrangement.]

123

No! Time, thou shalt not bost that I doe change,
Thy pyramyds buylt vp with newer might
To me are nothing nouell, nothing strange,
They are but dressings of a former sight:
Our dates are breefe, and therefor we admire,
What thou dost foyst vpon vs that is ould,
And rather make them borne to our desire,
Then thinke that we before haue heard them tould:
Thy registers and thee I both defie,
Not wondring at the present, nor the past,
For thy records, and what we see doth lye,
Made more or les by thy continuall hast:
This I doe vow and this shall euer be,
I will be true dispight thy syeth and thee.

11. doth] *do* M², A, Kt, Co, B, Del, Hu, Dy, Sta, Cl, Kly, Wh¹, Hal, Ty.
14. thee.] *thee;* M, Co, Del¹·², Hal; *thee:* A, Kt, Del³, Ty.

[For the reappearance here of the "doctrine of cycles," see notes on S. 59. LEE remarks of the present sonnet:] Sh. takes a bolder position, though again his intellectual courage evaporates when in face of the inevitable conclusion, and he weakly makes escape through an emotional commonplace. (*Qu. Rev.*, 210: 470.)

1. WYNDHAM: This apostrophe opens the peroration to the poet's attack on Time.

2. JORDAN [takes this to be a figurative expression for persons who have attained to places of power and influence formerly held by others; written soon after the fall of Essex.] DOWDEN: I think this is metaphorical; all that Time piles up from day to day, all his new stupendous erections, are really but "dressings of a former sight." Is there a reference to the new love, the "ruined love built anew" (S. 119), between the two friends? The same metaphor appears in the next sonnet [line 5], and again in [125, 3]. Does Sh. mean here that this new love is really the same with the old love; *he* will recognize the identity of new and old, and not wonder at either the past or present? TYLER: ["Pyramids" is] to be understood of anything grand or stupendous. HERFORD: "All that Time piles up from day to day," new structures of event. BEECHING: The new pyramids are any modern marvels which seem to defy change. For

"pyramid" in this general sense, cf. *Macb.*, IV, i, 57: "Though palaces and pyramids do slope their heads."

4. **dressings of a former sight.** WYNDHAM: Repetitions of ante-natal experience. ROLFE: "Dressings" = ornamental repetitions. LEE: Here Sh. draws further on that doctrine of the indestructibility of matter in spite of its outward mutability which Ovid expounds in his *Metam.*, bk. xv. [Cf. the passage from Golding's translation, quoted under S. 59, and further:]

> No kind of thing keeps aye his shape and hue:
> For nature loving ever change repairs one shape anew
> Upon another, neither doth there perish aught (trust me)
> In all the world, but alt'ring takes new shape.

5–6. BEECHING: We are so short-lived that we take for novelty what is really a new dressing of what is old.

7–8. DOWDEN: We choose rather to think such things ["what thou dost foist," etc.] new, and specially created for our satisfaction, than, as they really are, old things of which we have already heard. TYLER: Prefer to regard them as really new, just "born." WYNDHAM: Assuming these lines to refer to what Time "foists upon us," [Tyler's and Dowden's explanations are the best to be got.] But this reference of "them" to "what," followed by a singular "that is," can hardly be sustained grammatically, and it scarce makes sense. . . . I suggest that the plural "them" refers grammatically to the plural "dates," and that the word usually printed "born" in line 7 had best be printed "borne" as it is in the Q (= bourn; *borne*, French, and in *Hamlet*). We make our brief dates into a bourn or limit to our desire (cf. "confined doom," 107, 4), instead of recollecting that "we have heard them told" (= reckoned) before. (Intro., p. cxxix.)

11. **records.** ROLFE: Sh. accents the noun on either syllable, as may suit the measure. Cf. 55, 8.

12. HUDSON: Time's record of things is made big or little, to suit his swiftly changing occasions, and without any regard to what the things are in themselves. BEECHING: [All the works of Time] grow and decay, as he passes on his rapid course. [The latter interpretation is doubtless the right one. With "more or less," cf. 64, 8. — ED.]

MASSEY [believes this sonnet was written when Southampton was imprisoned in the Tower, after the Essex rebellion, and takes the "pyramids" to represent "the prison-house of Time." (p. 204.)]

124

Yf my deare loue were but the childe of state,
It might for fortunes basterd be vnfathered,
As subiect to times loue, or to times hate,
Weeds among weeds, or flowers with flowers gatherd.
No it was buylded far from accident,
It suffers not in smilinge pomp, nor falls
Vnder the blow of thralled discontent,
Whereto th'inuiting time our fashion calls:
It feares not policy that *Heriticke,*
Which workes on leases of short numbred howers,
But all alone stands hugely pollitick,
That it nor growes with heat, nor drownes with showres.
To this I witnes call the foles of time,
Which die for goodnes, who haue liu'd for crime.

8. **th'inuiting**] *the inviting* C, M, A, Kt, B, Del, Cl, Gl, Kly, R, Wh², Ty, Ox, Cam², But, Her, Be, N. **our**] *or* C.

10. **short numbred**] Hyphened by C, M, A, Kt, B, Del, Hu, Dy, Sta, Cl, Gl, Kly, Cam, Co³, R, Wh², Ty, Wy, But, Her, Be, N, Bull, Wa.

12. **nor growes**] *not grows* M¹; *nor dries* C; *nor glows* Stee conj., Kly; *nor droops* Be conj.

13. **foles of time**] *fooles of time* 1640; *fools of time* G, etc. (except But); *souls oftime* But.

---

1. TYLER: [This expression] is at least consistent with the supposition that the poet was thinking of Essex and the dignities he attained. (p. 25.) [SCHMIDT glosses "state" as "splendour"; ROLFE as "rank"; DOWDEN renders "child of state" as "born of place and power"; on the other hand, WYNDHAM, BUTLER, BEECHING, and LEE understand "state" as accident or circumstance ("circumstances of nature or fortune," says Beeching, "explained by 'accident' in line 5"). For the divergent meanings, cf. 64, 9 and 96, 12.] GOLLANCZ [explains the line as an allusion to Southampton's having been, as Lord Burleigh's ward, a "child of state," — brought up under the Queen. (See his note on line 7.) He does not, however, mean that the word "love" refers to the friend, as ARCHER understands, and takes pains to point out is impossible. (*Fort. Rev.*, n.s., 62: 820.)] ACHESON [finds an allusion here to a passage in Chapman's *Achilles's Shield:*

Far above
Their tympanies of state [i.e., Sh.'s sonnets], that arms of love,
Fortune, or blood shall lift to dignity.
(*Sh. & the R.P.*, p. 158.)]

BEECHING: The friend must have been some one whose friendship the poet might be charged with cultivating for the sake of the good fortune it might bring. It would not have been worth while to say that his love did not suffer "in smiling pomp," if pomp had no relation to his friend. (Intro., p. xxxi.)

2. **unfathered.** SCHMIDT: As not born in the natural way. WYNDHAM: Disinherited in favour of any other effect of Time and Chance. BEECHING: Without a true father, being begotten by Time upon Fortune, and so subject to his caprices. A bastard was *filius nullius*.

3–4. DOWDEN: Subject to Time's hate, and so plucked up as a weed; or subject to Time's love, and so gathered as a flower.

5. **accident.** SCHMIDT: Casualty, chance. [Cf. 115, 5.] WYNDHAM: A term of metaphysic: his love belongs to the absolute and unconditioned, to Eternity and not to Time. (Intro., p. cxxix.) [I fear (or rejoice) that there is no evidence of Sh.'s using the word in its metaphysical sense. — ED.]

7. **thralled.** ABBOTT: Sometimes passive participles are used as epithets to describe the state which would be the result of the active verb. (§374.) TYLER: The expression "thralled discontent" seems to suit perfectly the state of things after the rebellion [of Essex,] if we take the word "thralled" as referring to the severe measures by which the rebellion had been put down, and by which discontent was still restrained. (Intro., pp. 25–26.) GOLLANCZ: [The phrase] may perhaps refer to the growing feelings of discontent [about 1598] which were ultimately to find expression in insane revolt. . . . On Nov. 22, 1598, Southampton returned from the continent; "for his welcome," we read, "he is committed to the Fleet." . . . Though his friend, "the child of state," has suffered Fortune's spite, the poet's love, being no child of state, fears no policy, and knows no change. (Intro., p. xix.)

7–8. DOWDEN: When time puts us, who have been in favour, out of fashion. J.M.: The time referred to is unmistakably that after the accession of James; and the gunpowder plot is such a remarkable instance of a plot to strike a "blow of thralled discontent," . . . that in all probability [it] supplied Sh. with his figure. (p. 80.) BEECHING: I suspect the main reference here is to the Jesuit intrigues, "the blow of thralled discontent" being the Powder Plot. LEE: A possible vague allusion to the social and political unrest which distinguished alike the last decade of Elizabeth's reign and the first decade of James I's reign. Unemployment and Catholic plots against the throne were the chief causes of disquiet. The former source of "discontent," which produced much agrarian disturbance, might well bear the epithet "thralled." [It will perhaps caution us against rash inferences respecting the date of such a passage, if we remind ourselves how pertinent to any year of the last ten — or twenty — a reference in contemporary literature to "these troubled and discontented times" has

seemed, and how utterly at a loss posterity must be to identify such allusions with precision. — ED.]

9. **policy that Heriticke.** DOWDEN: The prudence of self-interest, which is faithless in love. [Cf. *R. & J.*, I, ii, 95, where Romeo calls unfaithful eyes "transparent heretics."] LEE: "Policy" means intrigue, underhand dealing. There is a possible reference to the short-sighted political intrigues of the "heretic" Papists.

10. MASSEY suspects here "an ominous hint" at the age of Queen Elizabeth.

11. **hugely pollitick.** HUDSON: Organized or knit together in a huge polity or state. DOWDEN: Love itself is infinitely prudent. TYLER: "Politic" seems here equivalent to self-sufficing, desiring no increase or extension, and fearing no enemies, like a well-ordered city or state. Cf. *M. Ado*, V, ii, 63–64: "So politic a state of evil that they will not admit any good part to intermingle with them." WYNDHAM: An independent and self-sufficing state. (Intro., p. cxxx.) BEECHING: Vastly wise and prescient.

12. STEEVENS: Though a building may be drown'd, i.e., deluged by rain, it can hardly *grow* under the influence of heat. I would read *glows*. MALONE: Our poet frequently starts from one idea to another. Though he had compared his affection to a building, he seems to have deserted that thought; and here, perhaps, meant to allude to the progress of vegetation, and the accidents that retard it. [Cf. 15, 1–2, 5–6.] BEECHING: The image is . . . of a great tree which neither sunshine nor storm can affect and which cannot be cut down. . . . If [the line] is meant to be parallel to line 6, we want instead of "grows" a word to repeat "suffers," such as "droops," which alliteration suggests. For the printer's error of *g* for *d*, cf. 144, 6, "sight" for "side." [Beeching might have supported his suggestion further by citing *2 H. 6*, II, iii, 45: "Thus droops this lofty pine." — ED.]

13–14. STEEVENS: Perhaps this is a stroke at some of Fox's Martyrs. MASSEY: The allusion is no doubt more particularly directed to Essex and his companions, who had died so recently. . . . The "fools of time" may give us the poet's estimate of Essex's attempt. He was one of those who had lived to reach the criminal's end, but who "died for goodness" in the sense that he, like Danvers, died devoutly, and took leave of life with a redeeming touch of nobleness. Essex was also popularly designated "the good Earl." (p. 207.) SIMPSON: [The "fools of time"] may be conspirators; . . . but they may be also politic friendships, which subsist only for selfish ends, and die in an atmosphere of truth and honour, false loves as distinguished from that true one of which he sings in S. 116. (p. 80.) DOWDEN: [The lines perhaps mean:] I call to witness the transitory unworthy loves (fools of time = sports of time; cf. 116, 9), whose death was a virtue since their life was a crime. HUDSON: Exceedingly obscure. [Perhaps the meaning is:] Those fools who make as if they would die for virtue after having devoted their lives to vice. SHARP: I summon those very detractors, those fools of a season, who, though they have lived to my harm, will thus ultimately still further cement our love. TYLER: These expressions . . . become intelligible when considered as referring to Essex and his companions,

and to the consequences of the rebellion. The "fools of Time" are those whom Time does what he pleases with, now raising them to the highest dignities, and now bringing them down to the scaffold. . . . The conspiracy and rebellion are evidently alluded to in the "living for crime," while in the "dying for goodness" we may recognise with equal facility an ironical allusion to the popular regard for Essex, after his execution, as the "good earl." (p. 26.) VON MAUNTZ [curiously interprets "foles" in an active rather than a passive sense, paraphrasing:] Those who snap their fingers at Time, and, although they are wholly bad men, yet (under such a government) pass as good to the moment of their death. WYNDHAM: [Line 14 means:] Who are so much the dupes of Time that they attach importance to the mere order of sequence in which events occur, and believe that a death-bed repentance can cancel a life of crime. . . . [In this sonnet,] developing the idea of mutations in fortune, Sh. glances aside at some contemporary reverse in politics or art which we cannot decipher. It may have been the closing of the theatres, the censorship of plays, the imprisonment of Southampton or of Herbert. No one can tell, nor does it matter, for the main meaning is clear: namely, that this absolute Love is outside the world of politics, which are limited by Time, and count on leases of short numbered hours. (Intro., p. cxxx.) BUTLER [defending his emendation "souls oftime":] Sh. would never call a man a fool for dying well after living ill, and there is no relevancy in calling such persons to bear witness to the fact that Sh.'s love for Mr. W. H. was not subject to vicissitudes. . . . I take the emended passage to mean, "If I have been inconstant, nothing can shake me further; in witness whereof I call the souls of those whose repentance even after a life of crime has been often genuine." BEECHING: I believe the allusion here is to the Jesuit conspirators whose object in life was to murder the king, and who when caught posed as martyrs for the faith. Such inconstancy of principle would justify the poet in calling them "the fools of time" and pointing his moral with them. The moral is that "Love is the only true policy." STOPES: [Line 14 means:] Who die for one good deed, after having lived a lifetime of evil. LEE: Penitent traitors, who expiated their crimes with piety on the scaffold. The words would apply to any political or religious conspirator against the throne who suffered capital punishment in Sh.'s day. All met their death with prayer and pious courage. To this fact the poet ironically directs attention by way of indicating that their lives, unlike his unalterable affection, were profitless because they were inconstant. PORTER: Those who, trusting to external favors, build upon them or upon policy, instead of relying on their own inner steadfastness, are the fools of time. Followers of occasion or change, they assume to be good (or bad) to serve private ends, and they are sure to be cheated by the ironies of life; those, finally, being sentenced for such goodness to die who have lived all their lives by means of their crimes. BRANDL: [The passage is strikingly suggestive of the Essex conspiracy. The next sonnet refers to the same subject, and promises the fallen friend the poet's fidelity. (p. xxii.)] [It is pleasant to conclude with the annotation of ROLFE:] The reference is hopelessly obscure, and I shall add no attempt to explain it.

BEECHING [notes the style of the sonnet as of Sh.'s more abstract character. (Intro., p. lii.) See note on 117, 9–10.]

MACKAIL: [The phrasing of this sonnet is singularly applicable to the sonnet collection and its fortune. For two hundred years the volume seemed as though "It might for Fortune's bastard be unfathered,"] the illegitimate issue of the press of a thievish publisher, little regarded, little mentioned for either praise or blame. But for the next hundred years which are now expiring the words in which that sonnet goes on are as strikingly applicable: "No, it was builded far from accident." (*Lect. on Poetry*, p. 180.)

125

Wer't ought to me I bore the canopy,
With my extern the outward honoring,
Or layd great bases for eternity,
Which proues more short then wast or ruining?
Haue I not seene dwellers on forme and fauor
Lose all, and more by paying too much rent
For compound sweet; Forgoing simple sauor,
Pittifull thriuors in their gazing spent.
Noe, let me be obsequious in thy heart,
And take thou my oblacion, poore but free,
Which is not mixt with seconds, knows no art,
But mutuall render, onely me for thee.
Hence, thou subbornd *Informer*, a trew soule
When most impeacht, stands least in thy controule.

1. **Wer't**] *Were it* M, A, B, Kly. **Wer't . . . me**] *Where it ought to be* [with question mark omitted] G^2, S^2, E.

2. **the**] *thy* or *thee* Sta conj.

4. **proues**] *prove* G^2, S^2, E, M, A, Kt, Co, B, Del, Hu, Dy, Sta, Cl, Gl, Kly, Wh, Hal, Cam, Do, R, Ox, Her, Be.

6–7. **rent For compound sweet;**] *rent, For compound-sweet,* S^1; *rent, For compound sweet* M^1, A, Kt, B, Dy, Sta, Cl, Gl, Kly, Cam, Do, Hu^2, R, Wh^2, Ty, Ox, Her, Be, Wa, Tu; *rent; For compound sweet* C, M^2, Co, Del, Hu^1, Wh^1, Hal; *rent? For compound sweet* But; *rent, For compound sweet;* Bull. **Foregoing**] *foregoing* G, S, E, M (not Bo), A, Kt, Co, B, $Del^{1, 2}$, Hu^1, Dy, Cl, Kly, Wh^1, Hal, Cam^1, Do, R, Ty, Ox, Wy, Bull.

8. **gazing**] *gaining* Sta conj., But. **spent.**] *spent?* C, M, etc.

11. **seconds**] *seasonings* Bulloch conj.

12. **render**] *renders* But.

1: **Wer't.** BEECHING: "Would it be." Commentators have ignored the fact that the verb here is conditional; and so they have not seen that the poet is repudiating charges laid against him by the "informer" of line 13. The charges are of caring too much for his friend's beauty and laying upon that a basis for eternity. **bore the canopy.** MASSEY: [The speaker] is a person who has borne the canopy of state, as a lord in waiting. That is not Sh. (p. 95.) STAUNTON: [An allusion to] some pageant in which the writer's friend had played, or might befittingly play, the leading part. . . . "Would it have availed me aught if I had paid homage to your personal dignity by assisting to carry the canopy over you?" (*Ath.*, March 14, 1874, p. 357.) HUDSON: Perhaps the meaning is, "Were it of any consequence to me that I walked at the Queen's side, and carried the canopy over her royal head, if I honoured only her outward form with mere external observances?" DOWDEN: Rendered outward homage, as one renders who bears a canopy over a superior. The metaphor was not so far-fetched in Sh.'s day as it would be in ours. [He instances several occasions when canopies were conspicuous in royal progresses.] TYLER: [Figurative; meaning that the poet's relations with Southampton] have been a "bearing the canopy," an "outward honouring," a "gazing" on his "extern." [See note on line 13.] WYNDHAM: The word may contain an allusion to some one of the many allegories current among the cultivated court circle of that day. . . . In a letter from Francis Beaumont to Anne Fytton . . . you read: "In which conceite of mine . . . your own preatie stoarie of the Canopy, and myne of Timantes for covering affectiones with curtaines may be my all sufficient warrant." (*Gossip from a Muniment Room*, 1897.) BUTLER: There is a reference to the bearing of a certain canopy, apparently on some very great occasion, over some great personage: Sh. seems either to have had some part in the bearing of this canopy, which had given rise to ill-natured remarks, or else to have been maliciously foiled in an attempt to be included among the bearers. [He is disposed to think that the occasion is the progress of the Queen to St. Paul's, Nov. 24, 1588.] (p. 112.) CREIGHTON: [The passage] recalls some great funeral at which Sh. had borne the canopy, perhaps that of Pembroke's father in Salisbury Cathedral [January 1601.] (*Blackwood's*, 169: 843.) BEECHING: A symbol of outward honour. ROLFE: On the 15th of March, 1604, when James made a formal march from the Tower to Westminster, the nine actors (including Sh.) to whom he had granted a special license to perform in London and the provinces, were in the royal train. . . . Whether the actors "bore the canopy" on this occasion I find no record; but I doubt whether there is a reference to it here. H. PEMBERTON [(*New Shakespeareana*, 8: 61), following a suggestion made by the Rev. W. BEGLEY, in *Is it Sh.* (p. 231), argues for the identification of this canopy with that carried over the queen by a number of noblemen, among whom was William Herbert, on the occasion of the marriage of Mistress Anne Russell, June 16, 1600.] DOWDEN [parries these efforts to date the sonnet by means of contemporary allusions with this admirable *reductio ad absurdum:*] I am persuaded that Sonnet 125 . . . was actually written by Sh. in Dublin in the year 1885, shortly after the visit of the Prince of Wales to the Irish capital. . . . The

sonnet is, indeed, packed full of allusions to the events of that period. There is the reference to the practice of boycotting tenants who, servile to the aristocracy, had paid their full rents [lines 5–6]. There is a clear reference to the inability of the crown to obtain convictions through its paid and perjured witnesses [lines 13–14]. If it be remembered that the Prince of Wales laid the foundation stones for a new museum and a national library, there can be no obscurity in the line "Or laid great bases for eternity"; while the canopy under which His Royal Highness stood on that occasion is expressly mentioned in line 1. . . . The word "heretic" in the preceding sonnet, and the reference to "leases of short numbered hours," manifestly applies to the Protestant landlords, whose days were now numbered. (*Academy*, Jan. 30, 1886, pp. 67–68.)

2. STEEVENS: Cf. *Oth.*, I, i, 61:

> When my outward action doth demonstrate
> The native act and figure of my heart
> In compliment extern.

[The *N. E. D.* gives no other instance of the noun "extern" in this meaning of "exterior, outward appearance."] WYNDHAM: Honouring outward beauty with public praise (cf. 69, 5); but, as I hold, with a larger philosophic suggestion, in the manner of the time, and in pursuance of the argument in the two preceding sonnets, viz. that the poet's love is esoteric and eternal.

3–4. DOWDEN: The love of the earlier sonnets, which celebrated the beauty of Sh.'s friend, was to last forever, and yet it has been ruined. TYLER: The reference is probably to the Dedication to the *Lucrece:* "The love I dedicate to your Lordship is without end," etc.

4. **proves.** See textual notes. TYLER: It is the anticipated "eternity" which "proves more short" than ruin. WYNDHAM: It is safest to preserve the Q text. . . . The sense here seems to be: "or ostentatiously claimed an eternity for my panegyrics,:which eternity proves short-lived as 'waste or ruining.'" [No interpretative explanation is necessary for "proves," as the ending in *-s* for the plural is sufficiently familiar. See note on 41, 3. — ED.]

5. **favor.** Cf. 113, 10.

6. **and more.** DOWDEN: Through satiety even grow to dislike.

6–7. See textual notes on punctuation. WYNDHAM: I preserve the punctuation of Q, emphasized, as it is, by a capital after the semicolon. . . . The "dwellers on form and favour" are "eternizers," with their "extern the outward honoring" to secure "eternity" by their public panegyrics. . . . The "compound sweet" for which they pay too much rent is their "couplement of proud compare," 21, 5; their "false painting," 67, 5; "false art," 68, 14; "strained touches," 82, 10; "comments of praise . . . golden quill" and "well-refined pen," 85, 2–8. . . . For these laboured tributes to outward beauty they forego the "simple savor," i.e., the simple appreciation of true affection. [This is ingenious, but quite superfluous for all who have less reverence than Wyndham for the Q printer's semicolons and capitals. — ED.]

8. STAUNTON: [Without the change of "gazing" to "gaining," the line] is

sheer, unmitigated nonsense. (*Ath.*, Dec. 6, 1873, p. 732.) BEECHING: Their love was a mere matter of "gazing," and so it was all expense without return, which is "pitiful thriving," i.e., bad business. [This is much better than ROLFE'S explanation of "pitiful thrivers" as "to be pitied even when successful." — ED.]

9. **obsequious.** HUDSON: Mourned or lamented. [A wholly unwarranted gloss. — ED.] DOWDEN: Zealous, devoted.

10. **oblacion.** WYNDHAM: Cf. Drayton, *Idea*, S. 54:

> Receive the incense which I offer here, . . .
> My soul's oblations to thy sacred name.

11. **seconds.** STEEVENS: I am just informed by an old lady that "seconds" is a provincial term for the second kind of flour, which is collected after the smaller bran is sifted. That our author's oblation was pure, unmixed with baser matter, is all that he meant to say. DYCE [(Aldine ed.) calls Steevens's note "preposterously absurd."] KNIGHT: [Steevens] mentions the flour, as in almost every other note upon the Sonnets, to throw discredit upon compositions with which he could not sympathize. He had a sharp, cunning, pettifogging mind; and he knew many prosaic things well enough. He knew that a *second* in a duel, a *seconder* in a debate, a *secondary* in ecclesiastical affairs, meant one next to the principal. The poet's friend has his chief oblation; no *seconds*, or inferior persons, are mixed up with his tribute of affection. [Steevens's explanation is accepted bodily by SCHMIDT, and by recent editors pretty generally.] WYNDHAM: May not "seconds" mean "assistants" and refer to the collaboration of the two poets in 83? It can hardly mean "baser matter"; since the contrast is between an offering humble, poor, and without art, and some other offering presumably rich and artificial, such as the verse of the rival poets. (Intro., p. cxxxii.) BEECHING: The word "oblation" suggested the simplest form of offering in the Levitical code, — a cake of meal; and this suggested the use of the word "seconds." ROLFE: For the figure I may add the familiar household one of "bolted" (sifted, like flour), which Sh. uses of persons (*H. 5*, II, ii, 137) and of language (*Cor.*, III, i, 322). . . . He has many other metaphors equally "vulgar," as Blair and certain other rhetoricians, trained in the school of Pope, call them. LEE: Cf. Sir Christopher Hatton, [who], writing to Queen Elizabeth in Nov. 1591, bids her "sift the chaff from the wheat so that the corn of your commonwealth would be more pure, and mixt grains would less infect the sinews of your surety." (Nicolas's *Life*, p. 497.) Miss PORTER [rejects Steevens's note as irrelevant, and explains "not mixt with seconds" as:] Not dependent upon the assistance of others, either by imitation or favor.

12. **render.** SCHMIDT: Surrender. [Cf. *Cymb.*, V, iv, 17: "Take no stricter render of me than my all."] **only me for thee.** TYLER: Alluding probably to the fiction of an exchange of hearts (Sonnets 22, 24). MASSEY: [With the whole line cf. Posthumus to his wife (*Cymb.*, I, i, 119): "As I my poor self did exchange for you," and Claudio to Hero (*M. Ado.*, II, i, 319): "Lady, as you are mine, I am yours. I give away myself for you and dote upon the exchange."]

13. **Informer.** SIMPSON: [Perhaps a spy to whose treachery was due the collapse of the "great bases" of line 3. (p. 80.)] DOWDEN: Does this refer to an actual person, one of the spies of 121, 7–8? Or is the "informer" Jealousy, or Suspicion? as in *V. & A.*, 655:

> This sour informer, this bate-breeding spy, . . .
> This carry-tale, dissentious Jealousy.

MASSEY: Camden tells us that amongst the confederates of Essex, one of them, whilst in prison, turned informer, and revealed what had taken place at the meetings held in the Earl of Southampton's house. [Here, therefore, Southampton, supposed to be speaking, flings his disdain at the informer.] (p. 209.) TYLER [believes that this informer had hinted that Sh. was unfaithful to the court party because of his early connection with Southampton. He implicitly denies that he had ever been on terms of intimacy with either Essex or Southampton. (Intro., pp. 31–32.)] WYNDHAM: This word of violent apostrophe refers to some person whose identity was obvious to the object of Sh.'s verse. . . . It may be compared to the "frailer spies" of S. 121. (Intro., p. cxxxii.) BUTLER [assuming that the friend is still addressed:] I can see no way of reconciling the fierceness of these [two lines] with the desire for reconciliation expressed in the preceding lines. The transition, however, is almost as abrupt in the closing lines of Sonnets 147–148. BEECHING: This is the false witness, of course imaginary, in the contest between the poet and Time, who brings the charge in lines 1–4. [Neither of Dowden's suggestions] has any relevancy here. WALSH: The reference may be to Time himself, who is called "envious and calumniating" in *T. & C.*, III, iii, 174. LEE: A jealous rival poet may be assumed to be the "suborn'd informer" here. PORTER: Time, personified as a treacherous, hired or "suborn'd" spy upon man. W. B. BROWN [(*N. & Q.*, 11th s., 6: 446) brings forward anew Dowden's interpretation that the Informer is Jealousy, and the theory is discussed by other correspondents, being opposed by C. C. B. in 7: 132, 153. Brown observes:] If the words . . . are applied to W. H., I do not see how they can be reconciled with the preceding four lines, or indeed with any part of the whole volume of sonnets. As to their being addressed to a third person, there is nothing in the sonnets to suggest that anybody else had anything to do with the matter. On the other hand, it seems to me a very natural conclusion to the group of sonnets for Sh. to say "Away with jealousy!" [Cf. also line 14.] Souls are controlled by passions and not by persons. (7: 76.) C. C. B.: May I ask Mr. Brown whom he takes for the "true soul" of the final couplet? Surely it is Sh. himself; it is Sh. who is "impeach'd," and, therefore, Sh. who does not stand in the "control" of the informer. How, then, can jealousy be the informer, for there is here no question of jealousy on Sh.'s part? (7: 153.)

BRADLEY: [In this sonnet] the poet repudiates the accusation that his friendship is too much based on beauty. (*Oxford Lect.*, p. 333n.)

126

O THOU my louely Boy who in thy power,
Doest hould times fickle glasse, his sickle, hower:
Who hast by wayning growne, and therein shou'st,
Thy louers withering, as thy sweet selfe grow'st.
If Nature (soueraine misteres ouer wrack)
As thou goest onwards still will plucke thee backe,
She keepes thee to this purpose, that her skill.
May time disgrace, and wretched mynuit kill.
Yet feare her O thou minnion of her pleasure,
She may detaine, but not still keepe her tresure!
Her *Audite* (though delayd) answer'd must be,
And her *Quietus* is to render thee.
( )
( )

2. **Doest**] *Dost* C, M, etc. **fickle**] *tickle* Kinnear conj.; *sickle*, But; *brittle* W. B. Brown conj. **sickle, hower**] *fickle hower* L; *fickle hour* C, Kinnear conj., But, R; *sickle-hour* Walker conj., Sta, Co³, Hu², Be, Bull; *sickle hour* Ty, Ox; *tickle hour* or *sickle lower* Brownlow conj.; *fickle mower* Bulloch conj.

4. **louers**] *lover's* Del conj.; *hours* But.

8. **wretched**] *wasteful* Kinnear conj. **mynuit**] *minuits* C; *minutes* M, etc.

This poem was omitted from the *Poems* of 1640 and the editions based thereon.

[C. A. BROWN seems to have been the first to call the poem an "envoy," making it the conclusion to the "fifth poem," Sonnets 102–126. DOWDEN calls it "the concluding poem of the series addressed to Sh.'s friend," i.e., 1–126, and has been followed by TYLER, WYNDHAM, BEECHING, and many minor editors. HERFORD suggests that it "may originally have concluded the series which ends at 99, forming a 'century.'" MASSEY calls it an unfinished fragment, belonging to the time when Southampton was a boy, and containing an idea that was worked up elsewhere (cf. Sonnets 11 and 104). (pp. 90, 220.) The late BRINSLEY NICHOLSON made the following note on the fly-leaf of his copy of C. A. Brown's book (now in the Library of the University of Illinois): "126 to me reads nothing like an envoy to anything, but how a sonnet reminding the young man of his increasing years and decaying beauty can be envoy to a poem in which he excuses himself for inconstancy I cannot understand." Beeching, opposing Herford's suggestion, observes that the poem "would not

come well after 99. It belongs to the second period, when passion has died down; like the sonnets from 100 onwards it is calm and contemplative and a little sad. Especially it chimes in sentiment with 104." (Intro., p. xxxii, n.) On this matter of the "envoy" I may quote, finally, from some remarks of my own, contributed to the *Kittredge Anniversary Papers*, 1913: "If we ask whether there is the slightest ground for supposing that it was meant by the poet as a conclusion to a preceding series, we find none. On the contrary, there is ground for believing just the opposite. If the 'lovely boy' here addressed is the beautiful youth to whom Sonnets 1–17 and many of the others were written, the poem is very naturally connected with the opening group of the collection, and with other sonnets standing at some distance from 126, in which the youth is warned of the flight of time and the approach of age. . . . Is there anything of the same character in the sonnets standing near the end of the 'first series'? On the contrary, their theme and tone are entirely different. If we assume the continuity of 109–125, there has been separation, estrangement, suffering, penitence, and this (possible) series is devoted chiefly to the hope that friendship will outlive these vicissitudes and put to shame the 'fools of time.' Now, suppose Sh. to be arranging the sonnets in some final form, and to be setting an epilogue or envoy to the series (a somewhat daring supposition), what will the envoy be? It may be on love, on friendship, on the steadfastness of a 'true soul' (end of 125), on the struggle of personality and friendship with evil days and 'policy' the heretic, — it may be a return to the ever-recurring theme of the power of poetry to eternize a friend; it may be almost anything, one might venture to say, rather than a return to the relatively trivial theme of the danger of the decay of the friend's youthful beauty. The assumption, then, that this little poem is an epilogue written by the poet for the whole preceding collection comes near being entitled to rank as a curiosity of criticism. . . . One would suppose, from the readiness with which the 'envoy' theory has been accepted, that it was customary to conclude Elizabethan sequences with something of the kind, in distinct metrical form. This is, of course, by no means the fact. The only thing of the kind that I recall is the three 'conclusions' (lyrics considerably longer than sonnets) which Robert Tofte appended to the three parts of *Laura*." (p. 286.) — ED.]

DOWDEN: In the Q, parentheses follow the 12th line, . . . as if to show that two lines are wanting. But there is no good reason for supposing that the poem is defective. In William Smith's *Chloris* (1596) a "sonnet" (No. 27) of this six-couplet form appears. [LEE also notes "so-called sonnets in twelve lines" in Lodge's *Phillis* (8, 26) and Linche's *Diella* (13). WALSH calls the poem a madrigal, saying that it "is as much like an Italian madrigal as the others are like Italian sonnets." (p. 262.)]

[LEE (*Life*, p. 97) discusses the poem as sounding "a variation on the conventional poetic invocations of Cupid or Love personified as a boy," and cites numerous parallels, such as Sidney's "blind-hitting boy" (*A. & S.*, 46), Greville's "sweet boy" (*Cælica*, 84), etc. So also in his commentary: "The tone of address does not harmonise with the theory that the 'fickle boy' and

'Nature's minion' is identical with the poet's friend of former sonnets. The poem, while subtilised by Ovid's philosophy, is in the vein of many lyrical apostrophes of the boy Cupid." As BEECHING remarks (Intro., p. xxxiii), this interpretation is impossible. "Cupid is immortal or he is nothing; and the point of the Envoy is that mortal beauty must fade at last."]

1. **lovely Boy.** [A puzzle for both Southamptonists and Pembrokists, especially the former. Thus BEECHING (assuming that the poem is as late as 1603, because it follows 107) asks: "Is it credible that any one, even if he were the greatest peer of the realm and the most bountiful of patrons, should have been addressed by Sh. as a 'lovely boy' when thirty years of age?" (Intro., p. xxxii.) There is no reason, however, whatever the date of S. 107, why we may not assume, if we choose, that S. 126 was written at the same time as (say) 54. — ED.]

2. **sickle, hower.** See the textual notes. [The Cambridge editors interpret Capell's MS. correction of "hower" as "hoar," and conjecture that he intended to restore "sickle" in place of Lintott's "fickle." I read his correction "hour," however, as noted above. — ED.] HUDSON [reading "sickle-hour"]: Time's hour, or course, is here represented poetically as a sickle. KINNEAR: [For the emendation "tickle," cf. Spenser, *F.Q.*, c. 8: "Which makes me loathe this state of life so tickle," and Heywood's *Epigrams:* "Time is tickell." (p. 502.)] TYLER [reading "sickle hour"]: His hour which, like a sickle, cuts off all things beautiful. E. B. BROWNLOW [(*N. & Q.*, 8th s., 3: 103) proposes to read either "tickle hour" (tickle = slippery) or "sickle lower." The boy holds (or stops) Time's fickle glass, and lowers (or prevents injury from) Time's sickle. C. C. B. (*ibid.*, p. 285) would retain the comma after "sickle," observing that "hour" has a peculiar application, as in the phrase "the hour has come."] BEECHING [reading "sickle-hour"]: When "the hour is come" the sickle strikes. Cf. *1 H. 4*, V, ii, 85:

> If life did ride upon a dial's point,
> Still ending at the arrival of an hour.

WHITE: A most remarkable instance of inversion for "Dost hold Time's fickle hour-glass, his sickle." ROLFE: The old text has not been satisfactorily explained. . . . I assume that "sickle" was a misprint for "fickle" (an easy slip of the type when the long *s* was in vogue), and that the meaning is "during its fickle hour." The boy simply held Time's fickle glass while it ran its fickle hourly course. The repetition of "fickle" is in Sh.'s manner. "Dost hold" = dost hold in hand, in check, "in thy power"; and "fickle hour" = Time's course that is subject to mutation and vicissitude. [This explanation is borrowed from J. CROSBY (*Lit. World*, 14: 64). In his first edition Rolfe duly credits his source, but in his revision forgets both acknowledgment and quotation marks.] W. B. BROWN [(*N. & Q.*, 11th s., 6: 446), proposing "brittle glass" and "fickle hour," observes that glass is called "brittle" in *R. 3*, IV, ii, 62, and in the *Pass. Pilg.*, 87, where "brittle" rhymes with "fickle." Objections to this are

found in 7: 32 and 153, with Brown's replies in 7: 76 and 236. One of the objectors ("Tom Jones," p. 32) compares with "sickle" Dekker's *Honest Whore:* "For all time's sickle has gone over you."] PORTER [reading "sickle hour"]: Sh.'s adjectives are descriptive of the changeableness of Time, whose glass is said to be fickle; and of the suddenness of Death, and his hour, for down-mowing by Time's scythe, is said to be *sickle.* LEE: Cf. Spenser, *F.Q.*, 7, 8, st. 1:

> Whose flowering pride, so fading and so fickle,
> Short time shall soon cut down with his consuming sickle.

[The serious objection to the text as it stands is that of the three objects enumerated two are concretely figurative, and the third is not — unless it means just the same as the first. It is impossible to say with any certainty how it should be emended. But I wonder why it does not seem to have occurred to any of those reading "sickle-hour," that this might be a clock of the old sort on which Time strikes the bell with his sickle. The only necessary meaning of the line is, "Hast seeming power to arrest the flight of the hours," and this would be figured vividly in power over both the running sands and the striking hour-bell. But this is not proposed with the assurance of a true commentator. — ED.]

3. **wayning growne.** Cf. 11, 1.

3–8. LEE: Sh., playfully adapting Ovid's doctrine of "growth by waning," follows the Latin poet in making "Dame Nature," by exercise of "cunning hand," (*artifices manus* in the Latin; cf. line 7, "her skill"), cherish youth at the outset in defiance of Time, "eater up of things." All Nature's efforts to discredit Time's power are, however, doomed to futility. . . .

> And when that long continuance hath them [i.e., living things] bit,
> You [i.e., Time] leisurely by lingering death consume them every whit.
> [Golding's Ovid.]

5. **wrack.** SCHMIDT: Destruction. [The regular form in Sh.]

8. **kill.** TYLER: The minutes are killed or annihilated, as leaving behind them no trace of their existence. BEECHING: The skill of Nature . . . may be said to kill [Time's] minutes, as it robs them of their influence.

9. **minnion.** SCHMIDT: Favourite.

11. **Audite.** Cf. 4, 12; 49, 4. **answer'd.** SCHMIDT: Paid [comparing *Lucrece*, 83: "That praise which Collatine doth owe enchanted Tarquin answers." But the passage belongs rather under the interpretation "render account of," for which Schmidt cites numerous instances. — ED.]

12. **Quietus.** STEEVENS [refers to his note on *Haml.*, III, i, 75: "His quietus make with a bare bodkin":] This is the technical term for the acquittance which every sheriff receives on settling his accounts at the Exchequer. Cf. Webster, *D. of M.*, I, i: "And 'cause you shall not come to me in debt, . . . here upon your lips I sign your *Quietus est.*" HUNTER: We find *quietus* and four other words which may be considered Exchequer terms within the compass of two lines. (*New Illustrations*, 2: 241.) **render.** SCHMIDT: Surrender, give up. [Cf. 125, 12.]

ROLFE [emphasizes the importance of the manner in which this sonnet is printed, as evidence that the Q was not issued under Sh.'s auspices. Sh. could not have inserted the parentheses indicating a supposed omission,] and Thorpe would not have done it if he had been in communication with Sh. In that case he would have asked the poet for the couplet he supposed to be missing, and would have been told that nothing was missing. (Intro., rev. ed., pp. 12–13.)

R. H. LEGIS [(*N. & Q.*, 5th s., 7: 261) interprets this poem mystically. The "lovely boy" is the completed portion of the sequence, the "immortalization of what was best" in Sh.] VON MAUNTZ [believes that it was addressed to the poet's son Hamnet.]

127

IN the ould age blacke was not counted faire,
Or if it weare it bore not beauties name:
But now is blacke beauties successiue heire,
And Beautie slanderd with a bastard shame,
For since each hand hath put on Natures power,
Fairing the foule with Arts faulse borrow'd face,
Sweet beauty hath no name no holy boure,
But is prophan'd, if not liues in disgrace.
Therefore my Mistersse eyes are Rauen blacke,
Her eyes so suted, and they mourners seeme,
At such who not borne faire no beauty lack,
Slandring Creation with a false esteeme,
Yet so they mourne becomming of their woe,
That euery toung saies beauty should looke so.

2. **weare**] *were* 1640, G, etc.

6. **faulse borrow'd**] Hyphened by M, B, Del[1,2], Dy, Sta, Hu[2].

7. **name**] *home* But. **boure**] *bower* 1640, G, S, E, Co, Del, etc.; *hour* M, A, Kt, B.

8. **not**] *not*, 1640, G, S[2], E, C.

9–10. **eyes . . . eyes**] *eyes . . . hairs* C; *hairs . . . eyes* Walker conj., Del conj., Hu[2]; *brows . . . eyes* Sta conj., Brae conj., Gl, R, Wh[2], Ox, But, etc.; *eyes . . . brows* Sta conj.; *hairs . . . brows* Kinnear conj.

10. **and**] *that* G[1], S[1]; *as* Dy.

[The first sonnet of what many, with TYLER, call the Second Series, or, like BEECHING, an "Appendix of Sonnets for the most part written to or about a Dark Lady."]

STEEVENS: The reader will find almost all that is said here on the subject of complexion is repeated in *L. L. L.*, IV, iii, 250–53, 258–61:

> O, who can give an oath? Where is a book
> That I may swear beauty doth beauty lack,
> If that she learn not of her eye to look?
> No face is fair that is not full so black. . . .
>
> O, if in black my lady's brows be deck'd,
> It mourns that painting and usurping hair
> Should ravish doters with a false aspect;
> And therefore is she born to make black fair.

[ISAAC discusses at length the resemblance of this sonnet and 132 to the passage in *L. L. L.*, as evidence that the dark lady was a real, not a fictitious, person. He also notes a resemblance to Sidney, *A. & S.*, 7:

> When Nature made her chief work, Stella's eyes,
> In colour black why wrapt she beams so bright?
> Would she in beamy black, like painter wise,
> Frame daintiest lustre, mix'd of shades and light?
> Or did she else that sober hue devise,
> In object best to knit and strength our sight?
> Lest if no veil these brave gleams did disguise,
> They sun-like should more dazzle than delight.
> Or would she her miraculous power show?
> That whereas black seems beauty's contrary,
> She, even in black, doth make all beauties flow!
> But so and thus, she minding Love should be
> Plac'd ever there, gave him this mourning weed,
> To honour all their deaths which for her bleed.

We may infer, Isaac suggests, that the sonnet is dated between Sh.'s reading of Sidney's sonnets and the writing of *L. L. L.* (*Archiv*, 61: 399–405.) KRAUSS (*Jahrb.*, 16: 186–87) finds the connection with Sidney's verse an evidence of his view (derived from Massey) of the "dark lady" sonnets as concerned with "Stella" (Lady Rich) and Herbert. He also notes a resemblance between the general tone of Sonnets 127–152 and the Fifth Song of *A. & S.*: "While favour fed my hope, delight with hope was brought," etc.] WHITE: This is an allusion to the remarkable fact that during the chivalric ages brunettes were not acknowledged as beauties anywhere in Christendom. In all the old *contes*, *fabliaux*, and romances that I am acquainted with, the heroines are blondes. And more, the possession of dark eyes and hair, and the complexion that accompanies them, is referred to by the troubadours as a misfortune. But the brunettes have changed the fashion since that day. Is it partly so because, as the naturalists inform us, the blond type is disappearing, and taste conforms to necessity? LEE: Neither in the sonnets nor in the play can Sh.'s praise of "blackness" claim the merit of being his own invention. [Cf. *A. & S.*, 7.] To

his praise of "blackness" in *L. L. L.* Sh. appends a playful but caustic comment on the paradox that he detects in the conceit ["O paradox! Black is the badge of hell," etc.]. Similarly, the sonnets in which a dark complexion is pronounced to be a mark of beauty, are followed by others in which the poet argues in self-confutation that blackness of feature is hideous in a woman, and invariably indicates moral turpitude or blackness of heart. Twice, in much the same language as had already served a like purpose in the play, does he mock his "dark lady" with this uncomplimentary interpretation of dark-coloured hair and eyes. [Here Lee gives no references; the only passages to which he can allude would seem to be 131, 13; 137, 12; and 147, 14, which are far from bearing out his description. It may be well here to note the passages, in addition to the present sonnet, in which a woman of dark complexion is definitely referred to: they are 130, 4; 131, 12–14; 132; 144, 4; and perhaps 147, 14. To this may be added references to a woman physically unattractive, but without further specification, in 137, 12; 141, 2; 148, 6. — ED.] The two sonnets in which this view of "blackness" is developed form part of a series of twelve, which belongs to a special category of sonneteering effort. In them Sh. abandons the sugared sentiment which characterises most of his 142 remaining sonnets. He grows vituperative, and pours a volley of passionate abuse upon a woman whom he represents as disdaining his advances. The genuine anguish of a rejected lover often expresses itself in curses both loud and deep, but the mood of blinding wrath which the rejection of a love-suit may rouse in a passionate nature does not seem from the internal evidence to be reflected genuinely in Sh.'s sonnets of vituperation. It was inherent in Sh.'s genius that he should import more dramatic intensity than any other poet into sonnets of a vituperative type; but there is also in his vituperative sonnets a declamatory parade of figurative extravagance which suggests that the emotion is feigned and that the poet is striking an attitude. [See further, regarding the vogue of the vituperative sonnet, notes on S. 147.] (*Life*, pp. 119–20.) W. C. HAZLITT: [Cf. Jonson, *Masque of Blackness*, especially the lines —

> Though he, [the sun] the best judge, and most formal cause
> Of all dames' beauties, in their firm hues, draws
> Signs of his fervent'st love, and thereby shows
> That in their black the perfect'st beauty grows.]

Perhaps Sh. saw this in MS. (*Sh., Himself & his Work*, pp. 256–57.) WALSH: The rare is most admired, or at least is most talked about. Southerners express admiration for blondes, northerners for brunettes. As the older poets were from the south, Sh. speaks of brunettes not having been in so much favour as blondes "in the old age." Ovid, indeed, has written:

> Candida me capiet, capiet me flava puella,
> Est etiam in fusco grata colore venus;
>
> (*Amores*, II, iv, 39–40)

in which the "etiam" is noteworthy. To import into poetry admiration for brunettes was something new. To a poet, moreover, fairness seemed celestial,

darkness the opposite; so that it appeared paradoxical to praise darkness, and the current admiration for the dark in feminine beauty went against the grain. [Cf. *A. & S.*, 7.] And Lilly wrote: "Oftentimes for fashion sake you call them beautiful, whom you know black." (*Campaspe*, IV, ii.) On the other side, as the word "fair" had already become synonymous with "beauty," to praise the beauty of a dark complexion (also "blackness" and "foulness" being almost identified) gave room for much word-play, of which the Elizabethans were extremely fond. Sh., perhaps himself smitten with admiration for some dark lady, makes the most of this word-play and contradiction; and when his mistress, all along unkind, showed herself morally frail, he found satisfaction in, and turned to poetical account, this agreement between her dark complexion and her black disposition. [Cf. *L. L. L.*, and notice that in *T. & C.*] the fickle heroine is likewise dark-complexioned. [M. B. OGLE (*Sewanee Rev.*, 20: 459) discusses the ideal of blond beauty as a literary conceit, giving examples from the classical and medieval poets as well as those of the Renaissance. He concludes:] What we commonly conceive to be the distinct type of southern beauty . . . is not the literary type at all; it finds no favor with the love poets of southern peoples, whose ladies are all blondes of the most pronounced type. (p. 466.) HORACE DAVIS: Cf. a poem in Bullen's *More Lyrics from Elizabethan Song-Books*, p. 65 (from Christ Church MS. K. 3):

> Let not thy blackness move thee to despair;
> Black women are beloved of men that's fair.
> What if thy hair her flaxen blackness lack?
> Thy face is comely though thy brow be black.

3. **successive.** SCHMIDT: Hereditary, legitimate.

4. TYLER: Beauty and Nature are slandered by the artificial asserting in effect that Art is better than Nature.

6. Cf. S. 68. **Fairing.** See note on 5, 4.

7. **boure.** See textual notes. SCHMIDT: Pleasant habitation. [The *N. E. D.* notes this passage under the secondary definition, "an idealized abode, not realized in any actual dwelling."]

9. **eyes.** [ISAAC, favoring the emendation "hairs," cites *L.L.L.*, "O, if in black my lady's brows be deck'd," where we are to understand "brows" as equivocal for either "eyebrows" or "forehead." Since black hair gives a fitting image for a mourning garment, the passage may be best understood, "Your forehead is clothed with black hairs." (*Archiv*, 61: 406.)] MASSEY: By "her eyes so suited" Sh. did not mean *also*, but her eyes *thus* dressed in black. A repetition which lays a double stress upon the eyes, and proves that neither the hair nor the brows were intended. . . . The woman of the latter sonnets is no more black-haired than she was black-skinned. If she had been, the black eyes would not have "put on" mourning. (p. 240.) [This is with reference to the identification of the lady with Penelope Rich, who was a blonde with black eyes.] WYNDHAM: No emendation is necessary. "Her eyes so suited" makes an additional proposition about the eyes which leads up to "and they mourners seem."

10. **suted.** SCHMIDT: Clothed. [Cf. 132, 12.] [I do not dissent from this usual interpretation, but think it possible that the meaning is "fitted," "adapted," as frequently in Sh.; — rather more probably than in 132, 12, where Beeching so renders it. — ED.]

12. MALONE: Dishonour nature by their imperfect imitation and false pretensions.

13. **becomming of.** SCHMIDT: According with. DOWDEN: Gracing. The word "of" is frequently used as here after the participles of transitive verbs. Cf. "fearing of," 115, 9, [and many examples cited by Schmidt under "of."]

13–14. VON MAUNTZ: Cf. Ovid, *Amores*, II, v, 44: "Maesta erat in vultu: maesta decenter erat." [Marlowe's translation: "She looked sad; sad, comely I esteem'd her."]

128

How oft when thou my musike musike playst,
Vpon that blessed wood whose motion sounds
With thy sweet fingers when thou gently swayst,
The wiry concord that mine eare confounds,
Do I enuie those Iackes that nimble leape,
To kisse the tender inward of thy hand,
Whilst my poore lips which should that haruest reape,
At the woods bouldnes by thee blushing stand.
To be so tikled they would change their state,
And situation with those dancing chips,
Ore whome their fingers walke with gentle gate,
Making dead wood more blest then liuing lips,
Since sausie Iackes so happy are in this,
Giue them their fingers, me thy lips to kisse.

1. **my**] *thy* 1640, G, S, E. **musike playst**] Hyphened by G^2, S^2, E.
4. **wiry**] *wity* G^1; *witty* G^2, S, E.
8. **thee**] *the* L.
11. **their**] *thy* G^1, S^1, C, M, etc.
14. **their**] *thy* 1640, G, etc.

MASSEY: The motive or conceit of [this sonnet] was borrowed from Ben Jonson's play, *Every Man out of his Humour* (III, iii), 1599. "*Fast.* You see the subject of her sweet fingers there [a viol de gamba]. Oh, she tickles it so, that she makes it laugh most divinely. I'll tell you a good jest now, and yourself shall say it's a good one; I have wished myself to be that instrument, I think,

a thousand times." (p. 232.) [SIMPSON, on the other hand, speaks of the idea as borrowed *by* Jonson (p. 73); and most commentators find nothing significant in the resemblance.]

SARRAZIN: [Cf. a sonnet of Constable's, entitled "Of her excellency both in singing and instruments":

> A lute of senseless wood, by nature dumb,
> Touch'd by thy hand doth speak divinely well.]
>
> (*Sh.'s Lehrjahre*, p. 153.)

1. my musike. ROLFE: Cf. 8, 1.

4. concord. MALONE: Cf. 8, 5.

5. envie. MALONE: This word is accented by other ancient writers in the same manner. So in Marlowe's *Edward II:* "If for these dignities thou be envy'd." [Cf. *T. of S.*, II, i, 18 (where, of course, we could not be sure of the accent by itself): "Is it for him you do envy me so?"—ED.] **Jackes.** [DOWDEN quotes from Fairholt, through Dyce's *Glossary*, a standard definition of the virginal jack as a "piece of wood, furnished on the upper part with a quill affixed to it by springs of bristle," which was "directed by the finger-key to the string"; but in defiance of the citation defines the word here as "*keys* of the virginal."] ROLFE: Here used loosely (as probably in common speech) for the keys. *N. E. D.*: By Sh. and some later writers erroneously applied to the key. [But no example is given from "later writers" unless it be the ambiguous passage from Middleton, *Father Hubbard's Tale:* "Her teeth chattered in her head, and leaped up and down like virginal-jacks."] DELIUS [supposes that the word is chosen for a play on its meaning of "fellows."]

6. STEEVENS: [Cf. Carey's] *Chrononhotonthologus:* "The tea-cups skip with eager haste to kiss your royal lip." MALONE: There is scarcely a writer of love-verses, among our elder poets, who has not introduced hyperboles as extravagant as that in the text, which the foregoing quotation was produced to ridicule. Thus Waller, in his "Address to a Lady Playing on a Lute":

> The trembling strings about her fingers crowd,
> And tell their joy for every kiss aloud.

LEE: Cf. *T. And.*, II, iv, 46: "And make the silken strings delight to kiss them."

14. **their.** [Miss PORTER alone makes her faithful effort to keep the Q text, explaining:] Because her fingers are given to them.

BUTLER: It has been argued from this sonnet that Sh.'s mistress was highly accomplished. One would like to have heard whether she could do more than strum. And one would also like to know how far Sh. was qualified to judge. The sonnet is conventional, and does not suggest a writer whose ear was likely to be much confounded by either concord or discord. MACKAIL [speaks of this sonnet, and of 145, as "both trivial in substance and undistinguished in style." Later he implies that they are not by Sh. (*Lect. on Poetry*, pp. 203, 205.)]

129

Th'expence of Spirit in a waste of shame
Is lust in action, and till action, lust
Is periurd, murdrous, blouddy full of blame,
Sauage, extreame, rude, cruell, not to trust,
Inioyd no sooner but dispised straight,
Past reason hunted, and no sooner had
Past reason hated as a swollowed bayt,
On purpose layd to make the taker mad.
Made In pursut and in possession so,
Had, hauing, and in quest, to haue extreame,
A blisse in proofe and proud and very wo,
Before a ioy proposd behind a dreame,
All this the world well knowes yet none knowes well,
To shun the heauen that leads men to this hell.

1. **Th'**] *The* C, M, A, Kt, B, Del, Cl, Gl, Kly, Cam, Do, R, Wh², Ty, Ox, But, etc. (except Wa).
3. **murdrous**] *murtherous* Wh¹, R; *murth'rous* Wh².
9. **Made**] *Mad* G¹, S, C, M, etc.
10. **quest, to haue**] *quest to have*, C, M, etc.
11. **proud and**] *prov'd, and* G¹; *prov'd a* S¹; *prov'd, a* C, M, etc.
14. **heauen**] *haven* 1640, G¹.

Massey [puts this sonnet in a pair with 146, and thinks that they were suggested by Sidney's pair on sensual and spiritual love, which followed the *A. & S.* in Sidney's Poems of 1598. The first of Sidney's is as follows:

Thou blind man's mark! thou fool's self-chosen snare!
Fond fancy's scum! and dregs of scattered thought!
Band of all evils! cradle of causeless care!
Thou web of will! whose end is never wrought.
Desire! Desire! I have too dearly bought,
With price of mangled mind, thy worthless ware!
Too long, too long asleep thou hast me brought!
Who should my mind to higher things prepare.
But yet in vain thou hast my ruin sought!
In vain thou mad'st me to vain things aspire!
In vain thou kindlest all thy smoky fire!
For virtue hath this better lesson taught:

Within myself to seek my only hire,
Desiring nought, but how to kill Desire.

"A theme thus adopted and developed from Sidney," says Massey, ". . . can no longer be considered as a passion personal to the writer." (p. 236.)] LEE: [The sonnet] treats with marvelous force and insight a stereotyped theme of sonneteers, and it may have owed its whole existence to Sir Philip Sidney's sonnet on Desire. . . . In *Emaricdulfe: Sonnets written by E. C.*, 1595, S. 37 . . . even more closely resembles Sh.'s sonnet in both phraseology and sentiment. (*Life*, p. 153.) [It is as follows:

O lust, of sacred love the foul corrupter,
Usurper of her heavenly dignity!
Folly's first child, good counsel's interrupter,
Fostered by sloth, first step to infamy!
Thou hell-born monster that affrights the wise,
Love-choking lust, virtue's disdainful foe,
Wisdom's contemner, spurner of advice,
Swift to forswear, to faithful promise slow!
Be thou as far from her chaste-thoughted breast,
Her true love-kindled heart, her virtuous mind,
As is all-seeing Tysan from the West,
When from Aurora's arms he doth untwind.
Nature did make her of a heavenly mould,
Only true heavenly virtues to enfold.]

ROLFE: Cf. *V. & A.*, 799–804:

Love comforteth like sunshine after rain,
But Lust's effect is tempest after sun;
Love's gentle spring doth always fresh remain,
Lust's winter comes ere summer half be done;
Love surfeits not, Lust like a glutton dies;
Love is all truth, Lust full of forged lies.

WALSH: Cf. Petronius, *Fragmenta*, 18:

Foeda est in coitu et brevis voluptas,
Et taedet Veneris statim peractae;

which was thus rendered by Ben Jonson:

Doing a filthy pleasure is, and short;
And done, we straight repent us of the sport.
[*Translations*, Cunningham ed., 3: 387.]

[And again, with the final couplet], *Fragmenta*, 23: "Nemo non haec vera dicit, nemo non contra facit." [The fact that Jonson translated one of these passages makes the suggestion of Petronius as a possible source not uninteresting, provided the two parallels are found in something like juxtaposition. Not discovering the second, however, in the standard editions of Petronius, I communi-

cated with Mr. Walsh, who has kindly written to me as follows: "The only edition of Petronius I had at the time was Guerle's French translation, with the Latin original at the bottom of the page. . . . The fragments are printed at the end of the *Satyricon*, and there are 36 of them. I now notice, what must have escaped me, that in the Introduction the editor says this collection of fragments was supposed to have been found at Belgrade in 1688, and was published by Nodot in 1692, and is considered apocryphal. The first one quoted, however ('Foeda est,' etc.), is evidently genuine, as it is accredited to Petronius in Baehrens's *Poetae Latini Minores*, vol. iv, p. 99; but the poem containing the other line is there ascribed to Florus, p. 348. To me it was significant that not only this sonnet but S. 20, besides 153–154, are paralleled by Latin verses. For this reason I should myself rather infer that we have no right to attribute either of the two first-mentioned sonnets to anything happening in Sh.'s life, but should look upon them merely as literary compositions, each expanding into 14 lines a Latin couplet." I am also indebted to Professor W. A. Oldfather for the statement that the epigram translated by Jonson appeared in the edition of Petronius made by Claudius Binetus in 1579 (see Riese, *Anthologia Latina*, p. xxxiii). This would account for its accessibility in the Elizabethan age, though I am not able to see that the matter is especially pertinent to the present sonnet. — Ed.] Notice that this sonnet has no connection whatever with any other sonnet or with anything else in Sh.'s writings. The nearest to it are some passages concerning lust in general: [*V. & A.*, 799–804, quoted above]; *T. G. V.*, I, i, 32–33:

> If haply won, perhaps a hapless gain:
> If lost, why then a grievous labour won;

M. W. W., V, v, 97–100:

> Fie on sinful fantasy!
> Fie on lust and luxury!
> Lust is but a bloody fire,
> Kindled with unchaste desire;

Haml., I, v, 55–57: "Lust . . . will . . . prey on garbage." For the style also cf. *R. & J.*, I, i, 196–200:

> Love is a smoke made with the fume of sighs;
> Being purg'd, a fire sparkling in lovers' eyes;
> Being vex'd, a sea nourish'd with lovers' tears.
> What is it else? A madness most discreet,
> A choking gall, and a preserving sweet;

T. & C., I, ii, 313–19:

> Things won are done, joy's soul lies in the doing; . . .
> Men prize the thing ungain'd more than it is. . . .
> Achievement is command; ungain'd, beseech.

Notice how much more terse is the style of this sonnet. Only the quotation from *Hamlet* is pitched in the same key.

[Cf. also (noted by TRENCH, below, and others) *Lucrece*, 690–714:

> This momentary joy breeds months of pain,
> This hot desire converts to cold disdain;
> Pure Chastity is rifled of her store,
> And Lust, the thief, far poorer than before. . . .
>
> While Lust is in his pride, no exclamation
> Can curb his heat or rein his rash desire,
> Till, like a jade, Self-will himself doth tire.
>
> And then with lank and lean discolour'd cheek,
> With heavy eye, knit brow, and strengthless pace,
> Feeble Desire, all recreant, poor, and meek,
> Like to a bankrupt beggar wails his case.
> The flesh being proud, Desire doth fight with Grace,
> For there it revels; and when that decays,
> The guilty rebel for remission prays.]

ROLFE: I could as soon believe the penitential psalms of David to be purely rhetorical and fictitious as the 129th Sonnet, than which no more remorseful utterance was ever wrung from a soul that had tasted the ashes to which the Sodom-apples of illicit love are turned in the end. . . . If this is supposed to be the counterfeit of feeling, I can only exclaim with Leonato in *Much Ado*, "O God! counterfeit! There was never counterfeit of passion came so near the life of passion!" (Intro., rev. ed., p. 19.) [The analogy of the penitential Psalms is a bit unfortunate, since they are now believed by many authorities to have reference to the sins of the Jewish people, not to those of an individual. One might observe, too, that the whole discussion of originality or unoriginality in connection with this sonnet is a rather droll exercise of the commentators. It is an outstanding exception to the series as a whole, in being such an account of its subject as might be given from experience or observation by nine-tenths of all the men who ever lived; hence to view it on the one hand as having reference to a particular experience of Sh.'s, or on the other as an imitation of other statements of the same fact, is equally perilous. — ED.]

1. **expence.** [Cf. 30, 8 (and note) and 94, 6. The *N. E. D.*, under the definition "the expending or using up (of material or immaterial resources)," cites *L. L. L.*, V, ii, 523: "So much expense of thy royal sweet breath."] TYLER: Cf. Bacon, *Nat. Hist.*, "It hath been observed by the ancients that much use of Venus doth dim the sight. . . . The cause . . . is the expence of spirits." (Spedding ed., 2: 555–56.) **Spirit.** SCHMIDT: Vital power, life. [Cf. *K.J.*, IV, i, 110: "The breath of heaven hath blown his (the coal's) spirit out"; *A. & C.*, IV, xv, 58: "Now my spirit is going, I can no more."]

1–2. WALSH: "Lust in action" is the subject, not the predicate. For the construction, cf. Wordsworth, *Excursion*, ix, 20: "The food of hope is meditated action."

4. **to trust.** ABBOTT: Infinitive active is often found where we use the passive. . . . This is especially common in "what's to do" for "what's to be done." (§ 359.) [See also FRANZ, § 497.]

9–11. See textual notes. WYNDHAM: "Proud" stands naturally for "proved" with, as always, *u* for *v* (and, as frequently, no apostrophe to mark the omission of a mute *e*). . . . "A" may well have been mistaken for the symbol of "and."

10. VERITY: [For the compressed grammatical construction, cf.] *T. & C.*, II, iii, 263: "He must, he is, he cannot but be wise"; and *Haml.*, I, ii, 158: "It is not nor it cannot come to good."

11–14. TYLER: Mr. Shaw has directed my attention to the following passage in Lodge's *Euphues Golden Legacie* (1590):

> Ah, Lorrell, lad, what makes thee Herry love?
> A sugred harme, a poyson full of pleasure,
> A painted shrine, ful-fild with rotten treasure,
> A heaven in shew, a hell to them that prove.

12. TYLER: Cf. *Lucrece*, 211–12:

> What win I, if I gain the thing I seek?
> A dream, a breath, a froth of fleeting joy.

[Rolfe quotes from TRENCH, on this sonnet, in the *Household Book of Poetry*, 1868:] The subject . . . Sh. must have most deeply felt, as he has expressed himself upon it most profoundly. I know no picture of this at all so terrible in its truth as, in *Lucrece*, the description of Tarquin after he has successfully wrought his deed of shame. But this sonnet on the same theme is worthy to stand by its side. ISAAC: Whether before or after Sh. any poet has accomplished something similar in this form, I cannot say, but I am rather disposed to doubt it; among his contemporaries no one composed anything like so magnificent a sonnet. One asks himself in surprise, Is this really a sonnet? that trifling, graceful, decorative, and yet rigid and troublesome form, in which poets are obliged to stalk about as in new and expensive holiday clothing, which threatens to spoil every free movement, every incautious touch? . . . What matter here whether one idea or a number of ideas? A flood of ideas rushes over us, every word an idea, every word a moral blow. The poet knows no restraints, he pours his whole heart out for us. And yet nothing is overlooked or changed of what makes up the law of this fixed form. (*Archiv*, 62: 27.) TYLER: In majestic strength [this sonnet] must claim pre-eminence. (Intro., p. 7.) The matter [of it] answers even in several details to the "Allegory" painted by Bronzino, now in the National Gallery. VERITY: I suppose there is nowhere in the plays and poems a more striking instance of compression than this sonnet affords. SHINDLER: The tragic terror of this tremendous poem coming with the most absolute incongruity between two light and playful sonnets might be enough of itself to mark the arbitrary character of the present arrangement. (*Gent. Mag.*, 272: 81.) FURNIVALL: To put [this] grand, pene-

trative, and weighty sonnet . . . before 1600–1601 is surely a misjudgment. (*Sh. & Mary Fitton*, p. 5.) P. E. More: The peculiarity of Sh.'s confession is that we see a sensitive soul actually in the toils of evil, which he deplores yet hugs to his breast. It is this association which makes the terrible 129th Sonnet unique in English — unique, so far as I know, in any language. Only the conscience of the Puritan united to the libertine fancy of a Cavalier (a phenomenon not easily conceivable outside of England) could have produced those words. (*Shelburne Essays*, 2: 41.) [Henry Davey, in the Memoir appended to the Stratford Town Edition of Sh., calls this "the very finest sonnet ever written in any language." (10: 279.)]

For the structure of the sonnet, see Beeching's note under S. 66.

130

My Mistres eyes are nothing like the Sunne,
Currall is farre more red, then her lips red,
If snow be white, why then her brests are dun:
If haires be wiers, black wiers grow on her head:
I haue seene Roses damaskt, red and white,
But no such Roses see I in her cheekes,
And in some perfumes is there more delight,
Then in the breath that from my Mistres reekes.
I loue to heare her speake, yet well I know,
That Musicke hath a farre more pleasing sound:
I graunt I neuer saw a goddesse goe,
My Mistres when shee walkes treads on the ground.
And yet by heauen I thinke my loue as rare,
As any she beli'd with false compare.

2. **Currall**] *Coral* G, etc. **lips**] *lips'* C, M, etc. (except Ty).
5. **damaskt**] *damask* G, S, E.
7. **is there**] *there is* G, S², E.

Beeching: A less pleasant variation on the *motif* of S. 21. [For examples of the sonnet style here ridiculed, see the notes on 21. To those there mentioned, Isaac (*Archiv*, 61: 393–96) adds a reference to Petrarch, Pt. 1, S. 8; canz. 6, str. 5; canz. 8, str. 4; Constable, *Diana*, S. 7:

> No, no, I flatter not when thee I call
> The sun, sith that the sun was never such; etc.

Sidney, *A. & S.*, 8, where Love is described as seeking heat, when cold, in the light of Stella's face; Lodge, *Phillis*, S. 8:

No stars her eyes to clear the wandering night,
But shining suns of true divinity,
That make the soul conceive her perfect light!
No wanton beauties of humanity
Her pretty brows, but beams that clear the sight
Of him that seeks the true philosophy!
No coral is her lip, no rose her fair,
But even that crimson that adorns the sun; etc.

KRAUSS (*Jahrb.*, 16: 200) compares the 5th Song of *A. & S.*:

Think now no more to hear of warm fine-odoured snow,
Nor blushing lilies, nor pearls ruby-hidden row,
Nor of that golden sea whose waves in curls are broken.

DOWDEN adds to the list Spenser, *Amoretti*, 15:

If sapphires, lo, her eyes be sapphires plain;
If rubies, lo, her lips be rubies sound;
If pearls, her teeth be pearls, both pure and round;
If ivory, her forehead ivory ween;
If gold, her locks are finest gold on ground;
If silver, her fair hands are silver sheen.]

FURNIVALL: [With the chaffing tone of the description cf. the poem "Ignoto," attributed to Marlowe:

I cannot whine in puling elegies,
Entombing Cupid with sad obsequies. . . .
Sweet wench, I love thee: yet I will not sue,
Or show my love as musky courtiers do.

(Bullen ed., 3: 246–47.)

Also a passage in the play of *Lingua* (before 1603): "These puling lovers — I cannot but laugh at them and their encomiums of their mistresses. They make, forsooth, her hair of gold, her eyes of diamond, her cheeks of roses, her lips of rubies, her teeth of pearl, and her whole body of ivory; and when they have thus idoled her like Pygmalion, they fall down and worship her." (Dodsley's *Old Plays*, 9: 370–71.) A similar passage is in Shirley's *The Sisters* (IV, ii):

Were it not fine
If you should see your mistress without hair,
Drest only with those glittering beams you talk of?
Two suns instead of eyes, and they not melt
The forehead made of snow! No cheeks, but two
Roses inoculated on a lily,
Between a pendant alabaster nose:
Her lips cut out of coral, and no teeth
But strings of pearl: her tongue a nightingale's!
Would not this strange chimera fright yourself?

(Quoted by Collier in a note to *Lingua*, as above; in Dyce's ed. of Shirley, 5: 399.)]

DYCE, [in a note to the passage last quoted, observes that in the volume called "The Extravagant Shepherd, . . . an Anti-Romance" there is] a portrait composed somewhat after [Shirley's] model: the hair presents two nets, in which hearts are ensnared; the forehead is a Cupid; the eyebrows are two bows, and the eyes two suns; the cheeks lilies and roses, the lips two bits of coral, the teeth pearls, and the bosom two globes, properly mapped out. [This picture is reproduced in Jusserand's *The English Novel in the Time of Sh.* — ED.]

2. LEE: Cf. "coral-colored lips" (*Zepheria*, 1594, No. 23); "No coral is her lips" (Lodge's *Phillis*, 1595, No. 8). "Ce beau coral" are the opening words of Ronsard's *Amours*, livre I, No. 23, where a list is given of stones and metals comparable to women's features. (*Life*, p. 118n.)

4. **wiers.** VERITY: Cf. Spenser's *Epithalamion:* "Her long loose yellow locks like golden wire"; [Barnes,] *Parthenophil*, 13: "Her hair disordered, brown and crisped wiry"; *England's Helicon*, (Bullen ed., p. 83): "Her tresses are like wires of beaten gold"; *Diella*, S. 3: "Her hair exceeds gold forced in smallest wire"; *Hero & Leander*, 4th sestiad, 290: "Her tresses were of wire, knit like a net"; Peele, *Praise of Chastity:* "Whose ticing hair, like nets of golden wire," etc. Was it something in the Elizabethan coiffure which suggested the comparison? LEE: Wires in the sense of hairs was peculiarly distinctive of the sonneteers' affected vocabulary. Cf. Daniel, *Delia*, 26: "And golden hair may change to silver wire"; Lodge, *Phillis:* "Made blush the beauties of her curled wire"; Barnes, *Parthenophil*, 48: "Her hairs no grace of golden wires want." (*Life*, p. 118n.) WALSH: Sh. himself has "wiry friends," of hairs, in *K.J.*, III, iv, 64. [Already noted by ROLFE.] And the expressions continued to be used. Thus Drummond has "dear coral lip" and "threads of golden wire" (Works, i, 45; ii, 151). Of the latter phrase perhaps the last appearance, swathed in quotation marks, is in Strangford's translation of Camoens' Poems [1803], where the translator says he has taken it from Drummond (though he uses it in a form more similar to Daniel's); while the former has passed over into Germany and reappears lustily in Lenau's "schönen Munds Korallenrand." (*Trias Harmonica.*) [The comparison of hair to wires is further discussed and illustrated in a note by HORACE DAVIS, *Critic*, n.s., 19: 419.]

5. **damaskt.** SCHMIDT: Of a mingled red and white. [Cf. *A. Y. L.*, III, v, 123:

> A little riper and more lusty red
> Than that mix'd in his cheek; 't was just the difference
> Betwixt the constant red and mingled damask.]

8. **reekes.** ROLFE: Properly = emits vapour, steams; but here probably used for the sake of the rhyme. [Cf. *L. L. L.*, IV, iii, 140: "Saw sighs reek from you."]

11. **goe.** See note on 51, 14.

MINTO [regards this mocking sonnet as evidence for his view that this whole group of sonnets "to a courtesan" are best regarded] as exercises of skill, under-

taken in a spirit of wanton defiance and derision of commonplace. When young Hal was told of his father's triumphs, the humorous youth indulged in a curious eccentricity, which, if I am not in error, represents exactly the spirit of these sonnets:

> His answer was, he would unto the stews,
> And from the commonest creature pluck a glove,
> And wear it as a favour; and with that
> He would unhorse the lustiest challenger.
>
> [*R. 2*, V, iii, 16–19.]

. . . The new sonneteer lays down a humorous challenge — Give place, ye lovers, who boast of beauty and virtue: my mistress is neither fair nor faithful. (*Char. of Eng. Poets*, pp. 211–12.)

ISAAC [cites a passage in Nash's *Pierce Penniless*, 1592, already noted by ELZE, regarding "an Inamorato Poeta" who will "sonnet a whole quire of paper in praise of Ladie Manibetter, his yellow faced mistress," and thinks it may be significant in connection with this sonnet.] The name *Manibetter* fits the sonnet-lady strikingly both in physical and moral relations. [He also comments on the sonnet as] the most complete contradiction of S. 99. And if we compare the whole series, the sonnets of Travel [see his note on S. 27] and those dealing with the Pain and Pleasure of Love [a group in which he puts 21, 36, 49, 56–58, 69–70, 75, 87, 91–96, 127, 130–132, 149, 151,] we find the same contrast throughout them: the former entirely under the domination of the Italian taste and the Italian theories of love, even if poetically carried out through the genuineness of the imagination; the latter so fresh and unadorned, so purely poetic, as to seem to proceed only from a poet who is writing a drama with a view to lashing the unnaturalness of euphuism. (*Jahrb.*, 19: 211, 208.)

[See MASSEY's note at the end of S. 96.]

131

THOU art as tiranous, so as thou art,
As those whose beauties proudly make them cruell;
For well thou know'st to my deare doting hart
Thou art the fairest and most precious Iewell.
Yet in good faith some say that thee behold,
Thy face hath not the power to make loue grone;
To say they erre, I dare not be so bold,
Although I sweare it to my selfe alone.
And to be sure that is not false I sweare
A thousand grones but thinking on thy face,
One on anothers necke do witnesse beare
Thy blacke is fairest in my iudgements place.
In nothing art thou blacke saue in thy deeds,
And thence this slaunder as I thinke proceeds.

1. **art as**] *art a* 1640; *art* G², S², E. **so as**] *yes so* G¹, S¹; *so* G², S², E.
3. **deare doting**] Hyphened by Del, Sta, Dy², Hu².
9. **sweare**] *sweare*, [or *swear*,] G¹, S¹, C, M, etc.; *swear;* G², S², E.

1–4. KRAUSS: Cf. Sidney, *A. & S.*, 5th Song, 56–61:

> I lay then to thy charge unjustest tyranny!
> If rule by force without all claim a tyrant showeth.
> For thou dost lord my heart, who am not born thy slave;
> And, which is worse, makes me most guiltless torments have.
> A rightful prince by unright deeds a tyrant groweth.
>
> (*Jahrb.*, 16: 201.)

5. **in good faith.** WYNDHAM [thinks these words should not be enclosed in commas, as by modern editors generally]; it is the author's tribute to the good faith of his mistress's detractors. [This suggestion is followed in the texts of BEECHING and WALSH.]

6. MCCLUMPHA: Cf. *R. & J.*, II, Prol., 3: "That fair for which love groan'd for and would die." (*Jahrb.*, 40: 188.)

13. TYLER: Cf. 144, 4; 147, 14.

13–14. BUTLER: The obviously genuine almost fierceness of these two lines at the conclusion of a conventional sonnet recall the concluding lines of 137, and also the abrupt changes of tone in the ending of the highly unconventional sonnets 147, 148, and 125.

14. **this slaunder.** ISAAC: [Contrary to Collier and others, who refer this to

earlier sonnets such as 70, the sonnet is self-explanatory, alluding to the allegation that the mistress is ugly. In the same way we should understand "black deeds" only of her tyrannical, distant personality. (*Archiv*, 61: 409.)] DOWDEN: The slander that her face has not the power to make love groan.

SHARP [conjectures that the group 131–136, together with 128, 139–140, 143 and 149, were actually sent to the mistress, the others in this part of the collection being "Sh.'s private journal of his passion." (Intro., p. 21.) See his note on S. 141.]

132

THINE eies I loue, and they as pittying me,
Knowing thy heart torment me with disdaine,
Haue put on black, and louing mourners bee,
Looking with pretty ruth vpon my paine.
And truly not the morning Sun of Heauen
Better becomes the gray cheeks of th'East,
Nor that full Starre that vshers in the Eauen
Doth halfe that glory to the sober West
As those two morning eyes become thy face:
O let it then as well beseeme thy heart
To mourne for me since mourning doth thee grace,
And sute thy pitty like in euery part.
Then will I sweare beauty her selfe is blacke,
And all they foule that thy complexion lacke.

2. **heart**] *heart*, M, A, B, Co³. **torment**] *torments* 1640, G, S, E, C, Kt, Co¹,², Del, Hu, Dy, Sta, Cl, Gl, Kly, Wh, Hal, Cam, Do, etc.
6. **th' East**] *the east*, G², etc.
9. **morning**] *mourning* G, etc.

LEE: [This sonnet reproduces Sidney's conceit (*A. & S.* 7; see under S. 127) that the lady's eyes are in mourning in order "to honour all their deaths who for her bleed." (*Life*, p. 119n.)] KRAUSS [following Massey (see note on 127, 9), observes that it is only the eyes that are black, and that the face is by implication that of a blonde, — Sidney's Stella again. (*Jahrb.*, 16: 188.)]

2. **torment.** [See the textual notes. COLLIER, evidently supposing that he was the first to correct to "torments," says that he owes the emendation to a correspondent by the name of J. O'Connell.]

5–9. DOWDEN: Cf. *T. of S.*, IV, v, 31–32:

> What stars do spangle heaven with such beauty,
> As those two eyes become that heavenly face?

SARRAZIN: Cf. *V. & A.*, 485–86:

> And as the bright sun glorifies the sky,
> So is her face illumin'd with her eye.
>
> (*Sh.'s Lehrjahre*, p. 155.)

9. **morning.** MALONE: The context, I think clearly shows that the poet wrote "mourning." [Cf. line 3.] The two words were, I imagine, in his time pronounced alike. In a sonnet of our author's, printed by W. Jaggard, 1599, we find: "In black morne I." The same sonnet is printed in *England's Helicon*, 1600, and there the line stands: "In black mourn I." DOWDEN: Probably a play was intended on the words "morning sun" and "mourning eyes." MASSEY, [though he prints the word "mourning," compares the passage with *A. & S.*, 48; "Soul's joy! bend not those morning stars from me." Miss PORTER would keep "morning," explaining:] Like the morning eye of the sun of heaven. [With the possible pun Mr. HORACE DAVIS compares a line in Dekker's *Shoemaker's Holiday*, V, ii: "Your morning mirth my mourning day hath made."]

11. Cf. 127, 13.

12. **sute.** See note on 127, 10. TYLER: Let every part of thee, and not merely thy eyes, pity me, and let every part wear a similar garb of mourning.

14. ROLFE: Cf. *L. L. L.*, IV, iii, 253 [see under S. 127].

BUTLER: [This sonnet may have been shown to Sh.'s mistress] instead of the preceding sonnet, which is much the same in substance.

133

BESHREW that heart that makes my heart to groane
For that deepe wound it giues my friend and me;
I'st not ynough to torture me alone,
But slaue to slauery my sweet'st friend must be.
Me from my selfe thy cruell eye hath taken,
And my next selfe thou harder hast ingrossed,
Of him, my selfe, and thee I am forsaken,
A torment thrice three-fold thus to be crossed:
Prison my heart in thy steele bosomes warde,
But then my friends heart let my poore heart bale,
Who ere keepes me, let my heart be his garde,
Thou canst not then vse rigor in my Iaile.
And yet thou wilt, for I being pent in thee,
Perforce am thine and all that is in me.

3. **alone**] *along* 1640.
4. **sweet'st**] *sweetest* G, S², E, B, Kly; *sweet* S¹. **be.**] *be?* G, etc.
9. **steele bosomes**] Hyphened by Kly.

BEECHING: This sonnet treats, from the woman's point of view, the same subject as Sonnets 34–35, 40–42.

1. SARRAZIN: Cf. *V. & A.*, 785: "No, lady, no; my heart longs not to groan." (*Sh.'s Lehrjahre*, p. 155.) **Beshrew that heart.** [An adaptation of a conventional imprecation. Cf. *M. N. D.*, V, i, 295: "Beshrew my heart"; *T. & C.*, IV, ii, 29: "Come, come, beshrew your heart"; etc. — ED.]

6. **ingrossed.** SCHMIDT: Taken the whole of. [Cf. *M. W. W.*, II, ii, 203: "Engross'd opportunities to meet her."]

8. **crossed.** DOWDEN: Cf. 34, 12; 42, 12.

9. VERITY: Cf. *R. 3*, I, ii, 204–05:

> Look, how my ring encompasseth thy finger,
> Even so thy breast encloseth my poor heart;

and Barnes, *Parthenophil*, 16: "That mine heart in her body lies imprisoned." LEE: Cf. 22, 5–7; 109, 3–4 [and notes. — ED.].

13–14. FLEAY: Cf. Drayton, *Idea*, S. 11:

> Since you one were, I never since was one;
> Since you in me, my self since out of me.

Transported from my self into your being,
Though either distant, present yet to either.
(*Biog. Chron.*, 2: 228.)

WALSH: Cf. *M.V.*, III, ii, 16–18:

One half of me is yours, the other half yours,
Mine own, I would say; but if mine, then yours,
And so all yours.

134

So now I haue confest that he is thine,
And I my selfe am morgag'd to thy will,
My selfe Ile forfeit, so that other mine,
Thou wilt restore to be my comfort still:
But thou wilt not, nor he will not be free,
For thou art couetous, and he is kinde,
He learnd but suretie-like to write for me,
Vnder that bond that him as fast doth binde.
The statute of thy beauty thou wilt take,
Thou vsurer that put'st forth all to vse,
And sue a friend, came debter for my sake,
So him I loose through my vnkinde abuse.
Him haue I lost, thou hast both him and me,
He paies the whole, and yet am I not free.

4. **restore to be**] *restore, to be* L, M, etc.; *restore to me* G[1]; *restore to me*, G[2], S, E.
9. **thy**] *my* B.
12. **loose**] *lose* G, etc.
14. **am I**] *I am* 1640, G, S, E.

LEE: The legal terminology in this sonnet (cf. 87, 3–4) again closely resembles that employed by Barnes in his *Parthenophil*, Sonnets 8, 9, and 11, where "mortgage," "bail," "forfeit," "forfeiture," "deed of gift" are all applied to the mistress's hold on the lover's heart. This sort of phraseology, applied to amorous purposes, was well satirised by Sir John Davies in his *Gulling Sonnets*, of which No. 7 opens: "Into the middle temple of my heart." TYLER: It would seem [from this sonnet] that it was on some business of Sh.'s that his friend had first gone to the lady. (Quarto Facsimile, Intro., p. xix.)

2. FLEAY: Cf. Drayton, *Idea*, S. 3:

> My heart hath paid such grievous usury
> That all their wealth lies in thy beauty's books.
>
> (*Biog. Chron.*, 2: 228.)

will. LEE: Her personality, in which "will," in the double sense of stubbornness and sensual passion, is the strongest element. . . . The word is not here italicised in [the Q], and there is no ground whatever for detecting in it any sort of pun [i.e., as in S. 135]. (*Life*, p. 425.)

3. **other mine.** DOWDEN: Other myself, my *alter ego*.

9. **statute.** MALONE: [The word] has here its legal signification, that of a security or obligation for money.

10. **use.** See note on 6, 5.

11. **came.** [For the omission of the relative, see ABBOTT's note on 4, 4. For the shortened verb form ("came" = became) see his note on 46, 9.]

12. **abuse.** TYLER: In exposing him to the danger.

VON MAUNTZ [thinks that this sonnet is addressed by a woman to her rival, and that in lines 7–8 she speaks of her marriage contract. (*Jahrb.*, 28: 282.)]

135

WHO euer hath her wish, thou hast thy *Will*,
And *Will* too boote, and *Will* in ouer-plus,
More then enough am I that vexe thee still,
To thy sweet will making addition thus.
Wilt thou whose will is large and spatious,
Not once vouchsafe to hide my will in thine,
Shall will in others seeme right gracious,
And in my will no faire acceptance shine:
The sea all water, yet receiues raine still,
And in aboundance addeth to his store,
So thou beeing rich in *Will* adde to thy *Will*,
One will of mine to make thy large *Will* more.
Let no vnkinde, no faire beseechers kill,
Thinke all but one, and me in that one *Will*.

2. **too**] *to* S, etc.

4. **will**] Italics by L.

6, 8. **thine, . . . shine:**] *thine, . . . shine?* L; *thine? . . . shine?* G, etc.

13. **vnkinde, no**] *unkind "No"* Do conj., Ox; *unkind no* Ty, Be; *unkindness* But, Wa. **faire**] *your* Ty conj. **kill**] *skill* Rossetti conj.

HALLIWELL: Cf. Parrot's *Laquei Ridiculosi, or Springes for Woodcocks*, 1613:

> Kinde Katheren to her husband kist these words,
> Mine owne sweet Will, how deerely doe I love thee?
> If true, quoth Will, the world no such affords,
> And that 't is true I durst his warrant be:
> For nere heard I of woman good or ill
> But alwayes loved best her owne sweet Will.

DOWDEN: In this sonnet, in the next, and in S. 143, the Q marks by italics and capital W the play on words, Will = William (Sh.), Will = William, the Christian name of Sh.'s friend (?Mr. W. H.), and Will = desire, volition. Here "*Will* in overplus" means Will Sh., as the next line shows, "More than enough am I." The first "Will" means desire (but as we know that his lady had a husband, it is possible that he also may have been a "Will," and that the first "Will" here may refer to him, beside meaning "desire"); the second "Will" is Sh.'s friend. TYLER: The dark lady has the "Will" of the poet's friend, meaning, no doubt, William Herbert. . . . An exceedingly interesting parallel to this and following sonnets is found in the Dedication by John Davies to his "Select Second Husband for Sir Thomas Overbury's Wife, now a Matchless Widow" (1606). And it is specially appropriate as being addressed to "William Earle of Pembroke":

> Wit and my *Will* (deere Lord) were late at strife,
> To whom this *Bridegroome* I for *grace* might send
> Who *Bride* was erst the happiest husbands wife
> That ere was haplesse in his *Friend*, and *End*.
> *Wit*, with it selfe, and with my *Will*, did warre,
> For *Will* (good-*Will*) desir'd it might be YOU.
> But *Wit* found fault with each particular
> It selfe had made; sith YOU were *It* to view; etc.
>
> (Grosart's *Chertsey Worthies' Library*.)

LEE: The groundwork of the pleasantry is the identity in form of the proper name with the common noun "will." This word connoted in Elizabethan English a generous variety of conceptions, of most of which it has long since been deprived. Then, as now, it was employed in the general psychological sense of volition; but it was more often specifically applied to two limited manifestations of the volition. It was the commonest of synonyms alike for "self-will" or "stubbornness" — in which sense it still survives in "wilful" — and for "lust" or "sensual passion." It also did occasional duty for its own diminutive "wish," for "caprice," for "good-will," and for "free consent" (as nowadays in "willing" or "willingly"). Sh. constantly used "will" in all these significations. . . . [In one] of Iago's sentences, "Love is merely a lust of the blood and a permission of the will," light is shed on the process by which the word came to be specifically applied to sensual desire. The last is a favourite sense with Sh. and his contemporaries. [Cf. *M. for M.*, II, iv, 164; *A.W.*, IV, iii, 19; *Lear*, IV, vi, 278; with passages from Sidney, Lodge, and Breton.] . . . It was not only in the sonnets that Sh. — almost invariably with a glance at its sen-

sual significance — rang the changes on this many-faced verbal token. [Cf. *L. L. L.*, II, i, 99–100; *Much Ado*, V, iv, 26–29; *M. W. W.*, III, iv, 58; etc.] . . . The corrector of the press recognised that Sonnets 135–136 largely turned upon a simple pun between the writer's name of Will and the lady's "will." That fact, and no other, he indicated very roughly by occasionally italicising the crucial word. Typography at the time followed no firmly fixed rules, and, although "will" figures in a more or less punning sense 19 times in these sonnets, the printer only bestowed on the word the distinction of italics in 10 instances, and these were selected arbitrarily. . . . They give no hint of the far more complicated punning that is alleged by those who believe that "Will" is used now as the name of the writer, and now as that of one or more of the rival suitors. . . . Similar passages abound in Elizabethan sonnets, but certain verbal similarities give good ground for regarding Sh.'s "will" sonnets as deliberate adaptations — doubtless with satiric purpose — of Barnes's stereotyped reflections on women's obduracy [e.g., *Parthenophil*, Sestine 2:

> But women will have their own wills, . . .
> Since what she lists her heart fulfills.]

The form and the constant repetition of the word "will" in these two sonnets of Sh. also seem to imitate derisively the same rival's Sonnets 72–73, in which Barnes puts the words "grace" and "graces" through much the same evolutions as Sh. puts the words "will" and "wills." (*Life*, pp. 416–21.) [See Lee's further notes, especially on 136, 13–14 and 143, 13, with reference to the question of more than one Will. In his edition of Sh. he comments further on the typographical problem, saying that the word "will" is so often printed as here in Elizabethan books that the typography gives no good ground for detecting puns.] Cf. John Davies's *Summa Totalis* (1607), where in the last 26 stanzas the substantive "Will" is used 30 times; it is italicised with the initial capital 12 times, and has the initial capital without the italics 16 times; such are mere typographical vagaries. ARCHER: [This sonnet makes it clear that Sh. speaks both of his mistress's will and Will his friend.] The only doubtful point . . . is whether there be not a third "Will," a third lover in the case. . . . The whole thing is flatly meaningless unless there are *two*. (*Fort. Rev.*, n.s., 62: 832.) MACKAIL: [While these sonnets suggest the view that the friend's name was Will,] they do not necessitate it: if analysed closely, they will be found to contain no thought or phrase which is not satisfied by a play of words between the poet's own name and the various senses which the word "will" bears as a common noun. (*Lect. on Poetry*, p. 194.) WYNDHAM: We learn from this and other numbers [that Will was] the name of both the poet and his friend. [See further, on this matter, the notes on line 2.]

1. LEE: An allusion to the current cant phrase, which was utilised as the name of a popular comedy by William Haughton, c. 1597, "A woman will have her will." BEECHING: If "will" [in this line] were a proper name, we should expect in line 4 "thy sweet wills."

2. MASSEY: [This] line only indicates the abundance and overplus of the lady's capacity of Will (not one or rather two more "Wills" by name); hence the context: . . . "To thy sweet will (not Wills) making addition thus." (p. 224.) From the beginning to the end of the sonnets there is but one "Will"; in each case he is the speaker, and nowhere is he the person who is spoken to. (p. 34.) BUTLER: Both the "Wills" I take to be Mr. W. H. BEECHING: The third Will here must be Sh., because "Will in overplus" corresponds to "more than enough am I"; and few critics with the 143d Sonnet also in mind would hesitate to refer the second Will to Sh.'s friend, for whom the "dark lady" had been laying snares. But the Southamptonites, who cannot allow that the friend's name was Will, are constrained to deny that there is any pun at all in 143, and to refer that in 135 to the distinction between "will" in its ordinary sense and "will" in the sense of "desire." But the balance of the line makes it almost necessary that, as "Will in overplus" must be a proper name, "Will to boot" should be a proper name also. (Intro., p. xxxvii.)

3. **am I.** HALLIWELL: Query — *I am?* In Sh.'s time quibbles of this kind were common. [He cites one from the *Book of Merry Riddles*, 1613, where *iam* added to *Will* = William.]

4. BUTLER: I suspect the "will" to be a printer's error for *Will*, i.e., Sh.

9. ISAAC: Cf. *T.N.*, I, i, 11: "Thy capacity receiveth as the sea," and II, iv, 103: "[My love] is all as hungry as the sea." (*Archiv*, 59: 252.) WALSH: Cf. *R. & J.*, II, ii, 133–34:

> My bounty is as boundless as the sea,
> My love as deep.

LEE: Cf. *3 H. 6*, V, iv, 8–9:

> Add water to the sea
> And give more strength to that which hath too much.

12. WALSH: It looks as though the Q had here capitalised and italicised the wrong "will."

13. PALGRAVE: Let no unkindness, no fairspoken rivals destroy me. W. M. ROSSETTI: "Kill" can hardly be right, and "skill" would make more sense . . . in the signification of "avail, succeed." (*Lives*, p. 54.) ISAAC: Let not thine unfriendliness slay sincere admirers. DOWDEN: If this be the true reading, we must take "unkind" as a substantive, meaning "unkind one" (i.e., his lady). So in Daniel's *Delia*, S. 2: "And tell th'Unkind how dearly I have lov'd her." But perhaps the line ought to be printed thus: "Let no unkind 'No' fair beseechers kill." SCHMIDT [defines "unkind," with a query, as a substantive meaning "unnaturalness, averseness to the works of love." ROLFE feels "strongly tempted" to adopt Dowden's emendation. SHARP accepts it, with the interpretation, "Let no unkind rejection of them kill such fair arguments."] MASSEY: [Dowden's reading] is to set up a plea on behalf of any number of rivals, and then to make the speaker ask that *they* may be mistaken for *him*, if they only bespeak her fairly. "Fair" is Shakespearean for to "make fair," which shows the antithesis to "unkind" or unnatural. I read the last two lines

as meaning, "Let neither of this class of beseechers conquer or kill, but think the whole of your suitors one, and that one me." (p. 224.) TYLER: I am inclined to accept [Dowden's emendation], with the exception that "your" would seem preferable to "fair." WYNDHAM: The rhythm, clearly indicated by a comma after "no" [Evidently an error for "after 'unkind.'"—ED.] in Q, would be shattered by [Dowden's] emendation. BUTLER [defending his emendation "unkindness":] I am told that the abbreviation "ne," with an elongated e, was in common use for "nesse" at the close of the 16th century. If this "ne" in the MS. was ever so little detached from the foregoing part of the word, it would corrupt readily into the text of Q. [HERFORD, though his text reads as in Q, writes a note apparently based on Dowden's emendation.] BEECHING: Let no unkindness kill any beseechers. For the adjective used as a noun, cf. "fair," 16, 11, etc. Dowden's suggestion . . . is ingenious; but the next line, "Think *all* but one," seems to require "*no* fair beseechers." LEE: Let not my mistress in her unkindness kill any of her fair-spoken adorers. (*Life*, p. 422.) [Agreement on this line is probably out of the question. Though usually suspicious of arguments based on rhythmical taste, I cannot help agreeing with Wyndham that Dowden's reading is metrically outrageous. On the other hand, Butler's emendation, perhaps alone of his many efforts to better the text, seems to me far from despicable; and if one should combine it with Tyler's "your," the result would be attractive. There is no warrant in usage for taking "unkind" as the abstract noun "unkindness." "Fair" as a substantive is analogous, to be sure, but was an independently well-established Elizabethan noun. — ED.]

14. LEE: Let her think all who beseech her favours incorporate in one alone of her lovers — and that one the writer, whose name of "Will" is a synonym for the passions that dominate her. (*Life*, p. 422.)

ISAAC [remarks of this sonnet and 136, as well as of 153–154, that] they are so filled with subtleties and plays on words, so wholly wrought in the conventional Italian taste, and show so extraordinarily little of Sh.'s specific characteristics, that [they may be thought to be even earlier than those that stand at the opening of the collection, and than *V. & A*]. (*Jahrb.*, 19: 196.)

BUTLER [believes the sonnet was written for Mr. W. H. to give to Sh.'s mistress ("who is now in her turn coy") as if written by himself.]

136

If thy soule check thee that I come so neere,
Sweare to thy blind soule that I was thy *Will*,
And will thy soule knowes is admitted there,
Thus farre for loue, my loue-sute sweet fullfill.
Will, will fulfill the treasure of thy loue,
I fill it full with wils, and my will one,
In things of great receit with ease we prooue,
Among a number one is reckon'd none.
Then in the number let me passe vntold,
Though in thy stores account I one must be,
For nothing hold me, so it please thee hold,
That nothing me, a some-thing sweet to thee.
Make but my name thy loue, and loue that still,
And then thou louest me for my name is *Will*.

4. **sweet**] (*sweet*) C; between commas by M, etc. (except But, first comma only).

6. **I**] *Ay*, C, M, etc.

7. **prooue,**] *prove;* M, A, Kt, Hu[1], Kly, Co[3]; *prove* Dy, Sta, Gl, Cam, Do, etc.

10. **stores**] *store's* G[2], S[2], E, C, Hal, Do, Hu[2], R, Ty, Cam[2], But, Be, N, Bull; *stores'* M, A, Kt, Co, B, Hu[1], Del, Dy, Sta, Cl, Gl, Kly, Wh, Cam[1], Ox, Wy, Her, Wa.

12. **nothing me**] Hyphened by G[1], S[1]. **sweet**] (*sweet*) C; between commas by Walker conj., Dy[2], Co[3], Hu[2], But, Be, Bull.

---

1. **check.** SCHMIDT: Chide. [Cf. 58, 7.]

2. **blind soule.** LEE: Sh. refers to the blindness, the "sightless view" of the soul, in S. 27, and apostrophises the soul as the "centre of his sinful earth" in S. 146. (*Life*, p. 422n.) [It is certain that the reference to S. 27 is irrelevant, for there the soul has a view which is "sightless" only because the eyes cannot see in the dark; that to S. 146 is somewhat cryptic. — ED.] **thy Will.** BEECHING: Perhaps "thy husband Will," or "my friend." But the third line renders the conjecture unnecessary.

3. **will.** BEECHING: Carnal desire [as in line 5]. Cf. *Lucrece*, 495: "But Will is deaf and hears no heedful friends."

6. **I.** DOWDEN: The usual way of printing our "Ay" at the time; but possibly there may here (as often elsewhere in Sh.) be a play on the words "I" = ay,

yes, and "I" = myself. **wils.** LEE: The varied forms of will, i.e., lusts, stubbornness, etc.

7. **receit.** SCHMIDT: Capacity, power of receiving and containing. ["Things of great receipt" = large matters. — ED.] **proove.** [The persistence of Malone's unintelligible semi-colon after this word is remarkable. For the meaning, cf. 72, 4, and note. — ED.]

8. [See DOWDEN's note on 8, 14. In connection with the latter passage WYNDHAM quotes from Cocker's *Arithmetick*, 1664: "Most authors maintain that Unit is the beginning of numbers and it self no number"; also from Marlowe, *H. & L.*:

> One is no number; maids are nothing, then,
> Without the sweet society of men.]

9–10. DOWDEN: You need not count me when merely counting the *number* of those who hold you dear, but when estimating the *worth* of your possessions you must have regard to me.

10. **stores.** See textual notes. SCHMIDT: Used only in the singular; therefore [read] "store's," not "stores'."

11–12. MCCLUMPHA: Cf. *R. & J.*, I, i, 183: "O anything, of nothing first create." (*Jahrb.*, 40: 197.)

12. **sweet.** [See textual notes. The "sweet" of line 4 is, one might say, an argument for the reading of Walker and Dyce; on the other hand, "to me" seems to call for the construction which is generally accepted. — ED.]

13–14. DOWDEN: Love only my name (something less than loving myself), and then thou lovest me, for my name is Will, and I myself am all will, i.e., all desire. TYLER: You love your other admirer named Will. Love the name alone, and then you love me, for my name is Will. LEE: "Make 'will'" (i.e., that which is yourself) "your love, and then you love me, because Will is my name." The couplet proves even more convincingly than the one which clinches the preceding sonnet that none of the rivals whom the poet sought to displace in the lady's affections could by any chance have been, like himself, called Will. The writer could not appeal to a mistress to concentrate her love on his name of Will, because it was the emphatic sign of identity between her being and him, if that name were common to him and one or more rivals, and lacked exclusive reference to himself. . . . The whole significance of both couplets resides in the twice-repeated fact that one, and only one, of the lady's lovers is named Will, and that that one is the writer. (*Life*, p. 424.)

[After this sonnet SHARP inserts the one appearing as No. 3 in *The Passionate Pilgrim* (also in *L. L. L.*, IV, iii, 60–73):

> Did not the heavenly rhetoric of thine eye,
> 'Gainst whom the world could not hold argument,
> Persuade my heart to this false perjury?
> Vows for thee broke deserve not punishment.
> A woman I forswore; but I will prove,
> Thou being a goddess, I forswore not thee:

My vow was earthly, thou a heavenly love;
Thy grace being gain'd cures all disgrace in me.
My vow was breath, and breath a vapour is;
Then, thou fair sun, that on this earth doth shine,
Exhale this vapour vow; in thee it is:
If broken, then it is no fault of mine;
If by me broke, what fool is not so wise
To break an oath to win a paradise?

He calls attention to the appearance in the present collection of two sonnets (138 and 144) which were included in *The Pass. Pilg.*, and believes this one fits in here] with peculiar applicability. It is the last time that Sh. hints there is anything more in his love than thraldom to a strong and subtle passion.

137

THOU blinde foole loue, what doost thou to mine eyes,
That they behold and see not what they see:
They know what beautie is, see where it lyes,
Yet what the best is, take the worst to be:
If eyes corrupt by ouer-partiall lookes,
Be anchord in the baye where all men ride,
Why of eyes falsehood hast thou forged hookes,
Whereto the iudgement of my heart is tide?
Why should my heart thinke that a seuerall plot,
Which my heart knowes the wide worlds common place?
Or mine eyes seeing this, say this is not
To put faire truth vpon so foule a face,
In things right true my heart and eyes haue erred,
And to this false plague are they now transferred.

2. **see**:] *see?* G, etc.
11. **not**] *not*, S^1, C, M, etc.
12. **face,**] *face?* G^2, C, M, etc.
13. **right true**] Hyphened by Del, Sta, Dy^2, Hu^2, Bull.

MASSEY [compares this sonnet, as well as 141, 148, and 150, for the theme of distorted eyesight, with Sidney's *A. & S.*, 34: "Stella's great powers, that so confuse my mind." (p. 246.)] LEE [compares it (and 148 and 150), for its unflattering attitude, with No. 7 of Jodelle's *Contr' Amours* (*Oeuvres*, 1597, pp. 91–94):]

Combien de fois mes vers ont-ils doré
Ces cheveux noirs dignes d'une Meduse?
Combien de fois ce teint noir qui m'amuse,
Ay-ie de lis et roses coloré?
Combien ce front de rides labouré
Ay-ie applani? et quel a fait ma Muse
Le gros sourcil, où folle elle s'abuse,
Ayant sur luy l'arc d'Amour figuré?
Quel ay-ie fait son œil se renfonçant?
Quel ay-ie fait son grand nez rougissant?
Quelle sa bouche et ses noires dents quelles?
Quel ay-ie fait le reste de ce corps?
Qui, me sentant endurer mille morts,
Vivoit heureux de mes peines mortelles.

(*Life*, p. 122n.)

[Most readers would probably find matter for contrast rather than comparison, in both these instances. — ED.]

1. **blinde foole love.** ISAAC: Cf. *A. Y. L.*, IV, i, 218: "That blind rascally boy that abuses every one's eyes because his own are out."

6. MALONE: Cf. *A. & C.*, I, v, 33: "There would he anchor his aspect" [i.e., in Cleopatra's brow.] ROLFE: Cf. *M. for M.*, II, iv, 4: "My invention . . . anchors on Isabel"; *Cymb.*, V, v, 393: "Posthumus anchors upon Imogen."

9. **severall.** MALONE: Cf. *L. L. L.*, II, i, 223: "My lips are no common, though several they be." [In a note on the latter passage, STEEVENS quotes Fenton's *Tragical Discourses* (1597): "He entered commons in the place which the olde John thought to be reserved severall to himself." See other notes, *ibid.*] HALLIWELL: Fields that were enclosed were called "severals" in opposition to "commons," the former belonging to individuals, the others to the inhabitants generally. When commons were enclosed, portions allotted to owners of freeholds, copyholds, and cottages, were fenced in, and termed "severals." (Quoted by Rolfe.) TYLER: Cf. Peacham, *Worth of a Penny:* "Others, not affecting marriage at all, live, as they say, 'upon the Commons'; unto whom it is death to be put into the Several." (*Eng. Garner*, 6: 261.)

10. F. V. HUGO: Cf. Molière, *Le Misanthrope:*

Celimène. Mais de tout l'univers vous devenez jaloux.
Alceste. C'est que tout l'univers est bien reçu de vous.

13. STOPES: [Cf. 36, 10.]

[Note the close relation of this sonnet with 148–150, which WALSH not unreasonably places immediately after it. — ED.]

138

When my loue sweares that she is made of truth,
I do beleeue her though I know she lyes,
That she might thinke me some vntuterd youth,
Vnlearned in the worlds false subtilties.
Thus vainely thinking that she thinkes me young,
Although she knowes my dayes are past the best,
Simply I credit her false speaking tongue,
On both sides thus is simple truth suppresst:
But wherefore sayes she not she is vniust?
And wherefore say not I that I am old?
O loues best habit is in seeming trust,
And age in loue, loues not t'haue yeares told.
Therefore I lye with her, and she with me,
And in our faults by lyes we flattered be.

7. false speaking] Hyphened by S^1, M, etc.
12. t'haue] *to have* C, M, etc. (except Bull).
[See below for the text of 1599, 1640, etc.]

[The chief interest of this sonnet is in the fact that it had appeared as the first poem of *The Passionate Pilgrim*, 1599, with a somewhat different text, as follows:

When my Love sweares that she is made of truth,
I doe beleeve her (though I know she lies)
That she might thinke me some untutor'd youth,
Unskilfull in the worlds false forgeries.
Thus vainly thinking that she thinkes me young,
Although I know my yeares be past the best:
I smiling, credite her false speaking toung,
Outfacing faults in Love, with loves ill rest.
But wherefore sayes my Love that she is young?
And wherefore say not I, that I am old?
O, Loves best habite is a soothing toung,
And Age (in Love) loves not to have yeares told.
Therfore Ile lye with Love, and Love with me,
Since that our faults in Love thus smother'd be.

DELIUS observes that the *P.P.* version] clearly shows that the text given by Thorpe [in the Q] was the original. The sonnet then dates at least before 1599,

therefore at least before the 35th year of the poet who here represents himself as an old man in love, — a circumstance which of itself might perplex an autobiographical interpreter. (*Jahrb.*, 1: 53.) ISAAC: From a comparison of the two texts that of 1609 appears the better in every respect. . . . [The *P.P.* version was probably] a corruption of the original published in 1609. (*Archiv*, 61: 400.) MASSEY: [If the two versions] are carefully compared, it will be seen that the subject involves more than "Age in love," and that the second version was modified of set purpose to conceal a fact which was manifest in the first one. As amended it is made to look as though the "Age in love" was applicable to both lovers, and that both were telling lies on the same ground of fact. But if both were old there would be no inequality and no need of falsehood or disguise. That the lady was old, or the elder, is certain. This is proved by the suppressed lines — "But wherefore says my Love that she is young?" (p. 251.) TYLER: A comparison of [lines 7–8] can scarcely leave a doubt of intentional alteration. "Outfacing faults with love's ill rest" agrees with the forced smile of the previous line: "I smiling credit her falsehood." In the second version, one might think "smiling" would have been better than "simply"; but "simply" and "simple" have come in together. [The change in line 4, in 1609, is] a tolerably manifest improvement. (pp. 135–36.) According to the [*P.P.* version, line 9], the dark lady falsely declared herself to be young. But elsewhere, even in 130 and 150, there is no indication of her being other than young; and this indeed seems implied in such expressions as "pretty ruth," "pretty looks," "lips that Love's own hand did make." And Sh.'s pretending to be youthful also implies that the lady was young. It is possible that Jaggard printed 138 from an inaccurate copy. . . . Perhaps, however, it is more likely that some one altered the last six lines to conceal Mrs. Fitton, who, in 1599, was in high favour at Court. (p. 81n.) WYNDHAM: [The variations in the *P.P.* version] with the unlikely repetition of "tongue" as a rhyme in the third quatrain, after it had served in the second, confirm the view that Sh.'s numbers in the *P.P.* were pirated, perhaps from recollection only. BEECHING: It is interesting to have so clear an example of Sh.'s rewriting. It will be noted that the amended copy gets rid of the difficult conclusion to line 8, and also of the new idea in line 9, which interferes with the statement of the two faults in the octave: viz., the woman's inconstancy and the man's pretence of youth and innocence. LEE: Jaggard [in the *P.P.*] seems to have presented an earlier recension of the text than figured in the edition of 1609. The poet's second thoughts do not seem to have been always better than his first. . . . Lines 6–9 [in the *P.P.* text], if less polished, are somewhat more pointed than the later version. (Intro. to *P.P.*, facsimile ed., 1905, pp. 22–23.)

1. **truth.** See note on 54, 2.

6. HUDSON: This was printed in 1599, when [Sh.] was but 35. Surely, in this case, his reason for using such language must have been that it suited his purpose as a poet, not that it was true of his age as a man. (Intro., ed. 1881, p. 84.) ISAAC explains the passage as meaning, "The best part of my life, the harmless

time of youth, is behind me." (*Archiv*, 61: 412.) [On this subject, cf. notes on 22, 1 and 62, 9–10.]

7. **Simply.** SCHMIDT: Absolutely.

9. **unjust.** SCHMIDT: Faithless. [Cf. *P.P.*, 331: "Unless thy lady prove unjust."]

11. **habit.** SCHMIDT: Appearance, deportment.

12. **t'have.** BULLEN: [We should keep this reading,] "years" having, as in many passages, the value of a dissyllable. **told.** Cf. note on 30, 10.

ISAAC: [This and S. 144 show that Sh. had made lyrical preliminary studies for the character of Cleopatra ten years before the play of *A. & C.*]. . . . As to the moral side of this sonnet, it is to be admitted that malevolence can attach to it a flippant interpretation, highly unfavorable for Sh.'s character. One has only to overlook the deep bitterness of the last lines, and interpret them as the mocking wisdom of a *blasé* and decayed man of the world. The judgment of the true admirer, who humbly seeks to approach the real thought and feeling of this great man through the veil of the words, will here as elsewhere be guided by the modesty and respect to which the unapproached moral greatness of the poet raises an imperative claim. It will find in this sonnet a portrayal of feelings such as are natural to a relation from which all mutual confidence has vanished; it will be forced to marvel at the inexorable self-judgment with which the poet sets to work. (*Archiv*, 61: 400, 412–13.)

[With reference to the 1599 version of line 9, VON MAUNTZ observes that the identification of the woman referred to with Mary Fitton is improbable, since a lady of twenty years would scarcely need to exert herself to seem young to a man of thirty-five.]

139

O CALL not me to iustifie the wrong,
That thy vnkindnesse layes vpon my heart,
Wound me not with thine eye but with thy toung,
Vse power with power, and slay me not by Art,
Tell me thou lou'st else-where; but in my sight,
Deare heart forbeare to glance thine eye aside,
What needst thou wound with cunning when thy might
Is more then my ore-prest defence can bide?
Let me excuse thee, ah my loue well knowes,
Her prettie lookes haue beene mine enemies,
And therefore from my face she turnes my foes,
That they else-where might dart their iniuries:
Yet do not so, but since I am neere slaine,
Kill me out-right with lookes, and rid my paine.

3. **eye**] *eyes* Wa.
10. **mine**] *my* 1640, G, S, E.

ISAAC: [With this sonnet and 140 cf. *A. Y. L.*, III, v, 1–7:

Sweet Phebe, do not scorn me; do not, Phebe.
Say that you love me not, but say not so
In bitterness. The common executioner,
Whose heart the accustom'd sight of death makes hard,
Falls not the axe upon the humbled neck
But first begs pardon. Will you sterner be
Than he that dies and lives by bloody drops?]

SARRAZIN: Cf. *V. & A.*, 499–502:

O, thou didst kill me; kill me once again.
Thy eyes's shrewd tutor, that hard heart of thine,
Hath taught them scornful tricks and such disdain
That they have murder'd this poor heart of mine.
(*Sh.'s Lehrjahre*, p. 155.)

3. MALONE: Cf. *R. & J.*, II, iv, 14: "Stabb'd with a white wench's black eye." MCCLUMPHA: Cf. *R. & J.*, II, ii, 71: "There lies more peril in thine eye than twenty of their swords." (*Jahrb.*, 40: 190.)

4. Art. SCHMIDT: Perhaps magic may be meant. [Cf. Prospero, *Temp.*, I, ii, 25: "Lie there, my art"; etc.]

5–6. VON MAUNTZ: Cf. *C. of E.*, III, ii, 8–13:

> Muffle your false love with some show of blindness;
> Let not my sister read it in your eye;
> Be not thy tongue thy own shame's orator;
> Look sweet, speak fair, become disloyalty;
> Apparel vice like virtue's harbinger;
> Bear a fair presence, though your heart be tainted;

and Ovid, *Amores*, I, iv, 69–70:

> Sed quaecumque tamen noctem fortuna sequetur,
> Cras mihi constanti voce dedisse nega.

[Cf. also note on 140, 5–6.]

7. **What.** SCHMIDT [though not citing this passage, notes that "what" is used with the meaning "why" especially before the verb "to need." Cf. ABBOTT, § 253.]

8. **bide.** Cf. 58, 7.

14. SARRAZIN: Cf. *R. 3*, I, ii, 150–53:

> *Glou.* Thine eyes, sweet lady, have infected mine.
> *Anne.* Would they were basilisks, to strike thee dead!
> *Glou.* I would they were, that I might die at once;
> For now they kill me with a living death.
>
> (*Jahrb.*, 31: 224.)

DOWDEN: Cf. Sidney, *A. & S.*, 48:

> Dear killer, spare not thy sweet, cruel shot;
> A kind of grace it is to slay with speed.

VERITY: Cf. Constable, *Diana*, 4th decade, S. 5:

> Dear, if all other favour you shall grudge,
> Do speedy execution with your eye.

[I have elsewhere pointed out that this and the following sonnet seem to be distinct from those which Lee calls "vituperative," and to be addressed to a mistress who is conventionally unkind and proud:] Many readers connect this pair with the preceding and the following, and Dowden comments to the effect that the poet "goes on to speak of his lady's untruthfulness." There is a possibility of reading unfaithfulness into the portrait; but surely the whole tone of the two sonnets is distinct from that of their neighbors. When we find "the wrong" done by the lady's "unkindness" developed by means of the conventional conceit — "Wound me not with thine eye," etc., we are naturally disposed to understand by that unkindness the usual *hauteur* of the besonneted lady of the period. In 140, too, is "disdain" the word for the lying mistress of 138 or the adulteress of 152? (*Kittredge Papers*, p. 282n.)

140

Be wise as thou art cruell, do not presse
My toung-tide patience with too much disdaine:
Least sorrow lend me words and words expresse,
The manner of my pittie wanting paine.
If I might teach thee witte better it weare,
Though not to loue, yet loue to tell me so,
As testie sick-men when their deaths be neere,
No newes but health from their Phisitions know.
For if I should dispaire I should grow madde,
And in my madnesse might speake ill of thee,
Now this ill wresting world is growne so bad,
Madde slanderers by madde eares beleeued be.
That I may not be so, nor thou be lyde,
Beare thine eyes straight, though thy proud heart goe wide.

4. **pittie wanting**] Hyphened by G, etc.
5. **weare**] *were* 1640, etc.
6. **yet loue**] *yet* (*love*) C; *yet, love*, M, etc.
11. **ill wresting**] Hyphened by L, etc.
13. **be lyde**] *be-lide* 1640; *bely'd* [or *belied*] G, etc.; *beli'd* N.

Krauss: [Cf. Sidney, *A. & S.*, 5th Song, stanzas 3–5:]

But now that hope is lost, unkindness kills delight;
Yet thought and speech do live, thought metamorphos'd quite:
For Rage now rules the reins which guided were by Pleasure.
I think now of thy faults, who late thought of thy praise.
That speech falls now to blame which did thy honour raise.
The same key open can, which can lock up a treasure. [etc.]

5–6. Von Mauntz: Cf. Ovid, *Amores*, III, xiv, 1–4:

Non ego ne pecces, cum sis formosa, recuso,
Sed ne sit misero scire necesse mihi;
Nec te nostra jubet fieri censura pudicam,
Sed tamen ut tentes dissimulare rogat.

[Marlowe's translation:

Seeing thou art fair, I bar not thy false playing,
But let not me, poor soul, know of thy straying.

Nor do I give thee counsel to live chaste,
But that thou wouldst dissemble, when 't is past.]

11. **ill wresting.** SCHMIDT: Misinterpreting to disadvantage.

12. WYNDHAM: The line may hold a reference to the poet's own case; cf. 112, 1–2; 121, 1–2.

14. MALONE: [Cf. 93, 4.] DOWDEN: [Cf. 139, 6.]

Cf. S. 93, and note.

141

In faith I doe not loue thee with mine eyes,
For they in thee a thousand errors note,
But 'tis my heart that loues what they dispise,
Who in dispight of view is pleasd to dote.
Nor are mine eares with thy toungs tune delighted,
Nor tender feeling to base touches prone,
Nor taste, nor smell, desire to be inuited
To any sensuall feast with thee alone:
But my fiue wits, nor my fiue sences can
Diswade one foolish heart from seruing thee,
Who leaues vnswai'd the likenesse of a man,
Thy proud hearts slaue and vassall wretch to be:
Onely my plague thus farre I count my gaine,
That she that makes me sinne, awards me paine.

5. **tune**] *turn* E.

6. **feeling**] *feeling*, M, A, Kt, Co, B, Del, Hu, Dy, Sta, Cl, Gl, Wh, Hal, Cam, Do, R, Ty, Ox, Wy, Her, N. **touches**] *touch is* But.

8. **thee**] *the* 1640.

11. **leaues**] *leave* Co, Hu[1]; *lives* Bo [error].

12. **vassall wretch**] Hyphened by Kly.

14. **awards me**] *rewards me* G[1], S[1]; *rewards my* G[2], S[2], E.

[This sonnet is apparently closely connected with 137 and 148–150. ISAAC (*Archiv*, 60: 62) calls it a "confirmation and elaboration" of 150. — ED.]

DOWDEN: Cf. Drayton, *Idea*, S. 29:

When conquering Love did first my heart assail,
Unto mine aid I summon'd every Sense:
Doubting, if that proud tyrant should prevail,
My heart should suffer for mine eyes' offence.

But he with beauty first corrupted Sight,
My Hearing brib'd with her tongue's harmony,
My Taste by her sweet lips drawn with delight,
My Smelling won with her breath's spicery;
But when my Touching came to play his part
(The King of Senses, greater than the rest),
He yields Love up the keys unto my heart,
And tells the others how they should be blest.
And thus by those of whom I hop'd for aid
To cruel Love my soul was first betrayed.

SARRAZIN: Cf. *V. & A.*, 437–42:

Though neither eyes nor ears to hear nor see,
Yet should I be in love by touching thee.
Say, that the sense of feeling were bereft me,
And that I could not see, nor hear, nor touch,
And nothing but the very smell were left me,
Yet would my love to thee be still as much.

(*Sh.'s Lehrjahre*, p. 155.)

ACHESON: [This sonnet again alludes to Chapman's *Banquet of Sense*. (*Sh. & the R.P.*, p. 127.)]

1–4. F. V. HUGO: Cf. Molière, *Le Misanthrope*, I, i:

Non. L'amour que je sens pour cette jeune veuve
Ne ferme point mes yeux aux défauts qu'on lui treuve;
Et je suis, quelque ardeur qu'elle m'ait pu donner,
Le premier à les voir, comme à les condamner. [etc.]

VON MAUNTZ: Cf. Ovid, *Amores*, III, xi, 33–34:

Luctantur pectusque leve in contraria tendunt
Hac amor, hac odiam; sed, puto, vincit amor.

[Marlowe's translation:

Now love and hate my light breast each way move;
But victory, I think, will hap to love.]

5. TYLER: Cf. 130, 9–10.

6. **feeling.** BEECHING: I follow Q . . . in reading no comma. The poet says that his delicate feeling is not "prone to base touches," not that it is.

8. **feast.** ISAAC: Cf. *L.C.*, 181: "Feasts of love I have been call'd unto."

9. **five wits.** MALONE: "The wits," Dr. Johnson observes, "seem to have been reckoned five, by analogy to the five senses, or the five inlets of ideas. 'Wit' in our author's time was the general term for the intellectual power." From Stephen Hawes's poem called *Graunde Amour and La Bell Pucel*, 1554, ch. 24, it appears that the five wits were "common wit, imagination, fantasy, estimation, and memory." **nor.** [For the construction, without "neither," cf. "He, nor," 86, 9, and see ABBOTT, § 396.]

11. COLLIER: The relative "who" agrees with the five wits and the five senses, so that "leaves" ought to be "leave." ISAAC: ["Unsway'd" refers to "heart";] for clearly the man must here sway the heart (he is only the empty likeness of a man, if it is "unsway'd"), not the heart the man. (*Archiv*, 60: 62.) DOWDEN: My heart ceases to govern me, and so leaves me no better than the likeness of a man — a man without a heart — in order that it may become slave to thy proud heart. TYLER: I cannot agree with Dowden's explanation. . . . I should take the meaning to be, in accordance with what goes before: the poet is entirely governed by his heart, which still does not sway his five senses, etc., these constituting together "the likeness of a man," that is, a man *minus* the heart. WYNDHAM: I agree with Tyler's [interpretation.] "The likeness of a man" = the five wits and five senses. BUTLER: Unswayed by anything that either wits or senses can urge, my heart as it were unmans itself, and is contented to be your drudge. BEECHING: ["Who" is the heart.] The heart by ceasing to rule leaves the man a mere likeness. LEE: Which, foregoing its control, makes of a man the mere husk or simulacrum of a human being. [I do not see that it follows, because "who" refers to the heart, that "unswayed" must mean "unswayed by the heart." The heart, as Tyler remarks, is having its way; but I cannot follow his corollary, being disposed rather to agree with Butler's rendering, "unswayed by wits or senses." My friend Professor W. D. BRIGGS brings to my attention a parallel for the notion that he whose heart has left him is the mere "likeness of a man," in an Elegy of Jonson's (*Underwoods*, 59; in Gifford's edition, 60):

> How shall I do, sweet mistress, for my heart? . . .
> And so I spare it: come what can become
> Of me, I'll softly tread unto my tomb;
> Or, like a ghost, walk silent amongst men,
> Till I may see both it and you again.
>
> — ED.]

14. **paine.** SCHMIDT: Heavy suffering. WALKER: In its old etymological sense of punishment. [So DOWDEN, WYNDHAM, BEECHING, and PORTER. TYLER and ROLFE dissent, and in a division I should join them, in view of 132, 4; 139, 14; and 140, 4. — ED.]

SHARP: [This sonnet was certainly not sent to the lady; and] it may be noted that the personal address characterizing the opening lines is forgotten in the couplet, where "she" usurps "thou." (Intro., p. 22.)

142

Loue is my sinne, and thy deare vertue hate,
Hate of my sinne, grounded on sinfull louing,
O but with mine, compare thou thine owne state,
And thou shalt finde it merrits not reproouing,
Or if it do, not from those lips of thine,
That haue prophan'd their scarlet ornaments,
And seald false bonds of loue as oft as mine,
Robd others beds reuenues of their rents.
Be it lawfull I loue thee as thou lou'st those,
Whome thine eyes wooe as mine importune thee,
Roote pittie in thy heart that when it growes,
Thy pitty may deserue to pittied bee.
If thou doost seeke to haue what thou doost hide,
By selfe example mai'st thou be denide.

1. **thy**] *my* 1640, G, S, E.
2. **my sinne**] *sin* G, S, E. **on**] *upon* G^2; *on a* S, E.
3. **state**] *sate* G^1.
8. **beds**] *beds*, S^1; *beds'* Kt, Del, Hu, Dy, Sta, Cl, Gl, Cam, Do, etc.; *bed's* Co^3. **beds reuenues**] *bed-revenues* C.
9. **Be it**] *Be't* Hu, Dy^2.
10. **wooe**] *woe* 1640.
12. **to pittied**] *pity'd to* C.
13. **hide**] *chide* Sta conj., But.
14. **selfe example**] Hyphened by G^2, S^2, etc.

Isaac: [This sonnet] is dependent in content on S. 152, but distinguished from it through the less passionate tone. (*Archiv*, 61: 177.) Wyndham: This sonnet is the last of four written in an unbroken chain, — the sense and even the phrasing of the concluding lines in each being taken up in the opening lines of the next. [Perhaps; but no more obviously than in many another doubtful case of sequence. — Ed.]

1. Massey: Cf. Sidney, *A. & S.*, 52: "A strife is grown between Virtue and Love." (p. 249.) **deare.** Schmidt: Inmost. [Cf. 131, 3.] Tyler: Cherished. Rolfe: Thy cherished virtue — the only virtue she has.

2. Wyndham: You hate my love, not because it is sinful, but because you love, sinfully, elsewhere. Butler: Hatred of my sin which is based upon my

love of you. ROLFE: She hates him for his love, and his love is sin; and so far she is right.

6. **scarlet ornaments.** MALONE: [Cf. *Edward III* (1596), II, i, 10. The following is the context, from line 6:]

> Loe, when shee blusht, even then did he looke pale,
> As if her cheekes by some inchaunted power
> Attracted had the cherie blood from his:
> Anone, with reverent feare when she grew pale,
> His cheekes put on their scarlet ornaments;
> But no more like her oryentall red,
> Than Bricke to Corrall or live things to dead.

DOWDEN: This line occurs in the part of the play attributed by several critics to Sh. [See notes on 94, 14. — ED.] A. PLATT [(*M. L. Rev.*, 6: 511) discusses the repetition of the line, as that of 94, 14, and finds it to be absurd in the play but in point in the sonnet, because here having reference to the scarlet wax with which the bond is sealed. Hence the dramatist was the borrower. MACKAIL, in his lecture published in the same year (1911), makes the same suggestion: the lady's wax-red lips are compared to the seal on a deed. But his inference is different:] The strong presumption is that the phrase in the play, whether Sh.'s own or another's, had clung in his mind and was here reproduced by him in a new application. (*Lect. on Poetry*, p. 187.) BEECHING: The parallel would suggest that this is an early sonnet, and the writing confirms the suggestion.

7. **seald.** MALONE [cites four other instances of Sh.'s figurative use of a seal for a kiss; e.g., *M. for M.*, IV, i, 5–6:

> But my kisses bring again,
> Seals of love, but seal'd in vain.

ISAAC (*Archiv*, 61: 180) raises the list to more than a dozen.]

7–8. FLEAY: I would point:

> And sealed false bonds of love, as oft as mine
> Robbed others' beds' revenues of their rents.
>
> (*Biog. Chron.*, 2: 224.)

GODWIN: The text, besides being ungrammatical, is so gross that it must be corrupt. . . . What the poet meant to say, I think, was, that she had no right to reproach him on the subject of kissing, because her lips had doubtless offended, as often as his lips had robbed the best revenues of the lips of their proper dues. (p. 144.)

8. ISAAC [discusses the construction of this line, inferring from their reading of "beds," not "beds'," that Malone, Collier, and Hazlitt took "revenues of their rents" as a double accusative with "others' beds." Since this construction does not appear elsewhere in Sh., most editors follow Knight in reading "beds'." But if we read "of their rents" as a genitive object, "Thou hast robbed the income of other beds of their rents," what is the meaning? Rents and income are the same thing. To avoid this difficulty, one may take "reve-

nues of their rents" as a single idea, as Lachmann did in translating it *Zinsertrag*. But "their" remains troublesome, as we should expect "revenues of rents." (*Archiv*, 61: 181.) Most readers doubtless find no difficulty in the prevalent text, understanding "revenues" as rightful receipts, and "rents" as the portion of these revenues which had been robbed. — ED.] LEE: Cf. Daniel, *Complaint of Rosamund*, 756: "The revenue of a wanton bed."

9–10. FLEAY: Cf. Drayton, *Idea*, 43:

> Why should your fair eyes, with such sovereign grace,
> Disperse their rays on every vulgar spirit,
> Whilst I in darkness, in the self-same place,
> Get not one glance to recompense my merit?
>
> (*Biog. Chron.*, 2: 224.)

[These two lines might be regarded as the germ of the following sonnet. — ED.]

10. DOWDEN: [This] carries on the complaint of 139, 6 and 140, 14. **importune.** [Regularly accented thus, on the penult, in Sh. — ED.]

11. ISAAC: [Cf. Wyatt, "The Lover Sendeth his Complaints," etc.:

> So wet her barren heart,
> That pity there may grow.]

11–12. WYNDHAM: [The first "pity" = compassion; the second "ground or subject for compassion."]

13. **hide.** SCHMIDT: Not let appear, suppress.

14. **By selfe example.** DOWDEN: On the precedent of your own example.

[Those concerned with the identification of the dark mistress find this sonnet a matter of contention, as to whether it indicates that she was an adulteress in the strict sense of being a married woman. TYLER explains line 8 as implying "that the lady had received the attentions of other married men." But those who oppose his Pembroke-Fitton argument say, with Miss PORTER, that this line and 152, 3 "constitute the practically insuperable obstacle to the theory that Mary Fytton was the mistress meant, for she was not married until 1607."]

TAINE [refers to this sonnet as representing "the intoxications, the excesses, the delirium into which the most refined artists fall" when they yield to the seductions of the flesh. (*Hist. Eng. Lit.*, van Laun trans. 2: 57.)]

143

Loe as a carefull huswife runnes to catch,
One of her fethered creatures broake away,
Sets downe her babe and makes all swift dispatch
In pursuit of the thing she would haue stay:
Whilst her neglected child holds her in chace,
Cries to catch her whose busie care is bent,
To follow that which flies before her face:
Not prizing her poore infants discontent;
So runst thou after that which flies from thee,
Whilst I thy babe chace thee a farre behind,
But if thou catch thy hope turne back to me:
And play the mothers part kisse me, be kind.
So will I pray that thou maist haue thy *Will*,
If thou turne back and my loude crying still.

1. **huswife**] *houswife* G²; *housewife* S², E, A, etc. (except Be); *house-wife* M.

WYNDHAM: This sonnet, also, belongs to the unbroken chain of the preceding four. [The couplet restates the sense of 142, 11–14.]

ACHESON: [This] sonnet seems to be a reflection of some verses in the poem of "The Two Italian Gentlemen" [upon which the story of *T. G. V.* is usually supposed to be founded]. . . . Cf.:

> Lo! here the common fault of love,
> To follow her that flies,
> And fly from her that makes her wail
> With loud lamenting cries.
>
> (*Sh. & the R.P.*, pp. 46, 48.)

[A closer relationship with the situation represented in Sonnets 133–134 is suggested than with those which intervene. — ED.]

4. **pursuit.** WALKER [collects a number of parallels for the accent on the penult. Cf. the verb in *M.V.*, IV, i, 298].

9. TYLER: Cf. 41, 7.

13. **Will.** DOWDEN: Possibly, as Steevens takes it, Will Shakspere; but it seems as likely, or perhaps more likely, to be Sh.'s friend "Will" (?W. H.). . . . Sh. will pray for her success in the chase of the fugitive (Will?), on condition that, if successful, she will turn back to him, Sh. [So ROLFE.] TYLER: Meaning probably her purpose, and also William Herbert. [This outpost of the Pem-

brokists may be said to have been captured, and its guns turned against them, by SARRAZIN (*Sh.'s Lehrjahre*, p. 158), who reads "as in a palimpsest" the original text of these lines, as follows:

> So will I pray that thou mayst have thy *Hen*,
> If thou turn back, and my loud crying pen.

This was later changed by the poet to a less objectionable form. The reader must admit that if the couplet was not thus written by Sh., with reference to Henry Wriothesley, it ought to have been! — ED.] LEE: [In italics] by what is almost certainly a typographical accident. . . . The poet . . . lightly makes play with the current catch-phrase ("a woman will have her will"), and amiably wishes his mistress success in her chase, on condition that, having recaptured the truant bird, she turn back and treat him, her babe, with kindness. . . . No pun on a man's name of "Will" can be fairly wrested from the context. (*Life*, p. 426.) BEECHING: It is certain from the sonnet which follows that a play is intended upon the name of the poet's friend.

STEEVENS: The image with which this sonnet begins is at once pleasing and natural; but the conclusion of it is lame and impotent indeed. We attend to the cries of the infant, but laugh at the loud blubberings of the great boy *Will*. ISAAC: As to the amusing character of this picture, I am of the opinion that one could find a large number of similar images in the plays, which, if they are depicted with painful precision by the imagination of the reader, have something of the comic about them. It is just these numerous similes of gripping reality which produce, often not a congenial or beautiful, but always a powerful effect. . . . The image overflowed from his full heart, and even then he would certainly not have expressed it, if he could have suspected that after some centuries certain critics would discover the comic in it, — something which resides, after all, only in the esthetic point of view. (*Archiv*, 59: 256, 260.) [Isaac also discusses interestingly the implications of the sonnet respecting the character of Sh.] BEECHING: The sonnet is no doubt intended to be only half serious, like the one that follows. LEE: The moral of the sonnet is somewhat equivocal. . . . The poet, so far from regarding the escaping thing as a serious rival, wishes the woman success in the chase on condition that she will then come back and kiss his tears away. There is some suggestion of a "ménage à trois." [See note on S. 40.]

HORACE DAVIS: I am reminded by this sonnet of some of the features of the situation in *A. Y. L.*, III, v. There is Rosalind the charming youth, Phebe the dark beauty, and Silvius the rejected lover, whose devotion under adverse circumstances finds utterance in these lines (99–104):

> So holy and so perfect is my love,
> And I in such a poverty of grace,
> That I shall think it a most plenteous crop
> To glean the broken ears after the man
> That the main harvest reaps. Loose now and then
> A scatter'd smile, and that I'll live upon.

144

Two loues I haue of comfort and dispaire,
Which like two spirits do sugiest me still,
The better angell is a man right faire:
The worser spirit a woman collour'd il.
To win me soone to hell my femall euill,
Tempteth my better angel from my sight,
And would corrupt my saint to be a diuel:
Wooing his purity with her fowle pride.
And whether that my angel be turn'd finde,
Suspect I may, yet not directly tell,
But being both from me both to each friend,
I gesse one angel in an others hel.
Yet this shal I nere know but liue in doubt,
Till my bad angel fire my good one out.

2. sugiest] *suggest* 1640, etc.
6. sight] *side* 1640, etc.
9. finde] *feend* 1640; *fiend* G, etc.
[See below for the text of 1599, 1640, etc.]

This sonnet, like 138, appeared in *The Passionate Pilgrim*, 1599, — the second number in the collection. The following is the *P.P.* text:

Two Loves I have, of Comfort, and Despaire,
That like two Spirits, do suggest me still:
My better Angell is a Man (right faire)
My worser spirite a Woman (colour'd ill.)
To winne me soone to hell, my Female evill
Tempteth my better Angell from my side,
And would corrupt my Saint to be a Divell,
Wooing his purity with her faire pride.
And whether that my Angell be turnde feend,
Suspect I may (yet not directly tell:
For being both to me: both, to each friend,
I ghesse one Angell in anothers hell:
The truth I shall not know, but live in doubt,
Till my bad Angell fire my good one out.

TYLER: [The changes in lines 3, 8, 13 from the *P.P.* version] may possibly have proceeded from revision. LEE: Jaggard's second sonnet [in the *P.P.*]

shows fewer discrepancies with that of 1609 [than his version of 138], and his version is on the whole the better of the two. (*Intro. to P.P.*, facsimile ed., 1905, pp. 23–24.) BEECHING: ["Fair," line 8, the only important variation in the *P.P.* text,] is clearly a blunder.

DOWDEN: [Cf. Drayton, *Idea*, S. 20; especially lines 1, 3, 13–14:]

> An evil Spirit (your beauty) haunts me still,
> Wherewith, alas, I have been long possest;
> Which ceaseth not to attempt me to each ill,
> Nor give me once but one poor minute's rest.
> In me it speaks, whether I sleep or wake:
> And when by means to drive it out I try,
> With greater torments then it me doth take,
> And tortures me in most extremity.
> Before my face it lays down my despairs,
> And hastes me on unto a sudden death:
> Now tempting me to drown myself in tears;
> And then in sighing to give up my breath.
> Thus am I still provok'd to every evil,
> By this good-wicked Spirit, sweet Angel-Devil.

TYLER: A comparison of this sonnet with Sh.'s can scarcely make it other than probable that the resemblance is not accidental. But as S. 144 was contained in the *Passionate Pilgrim* (1599), it might seem possible that Drayton had seen it in this collection, and that he imitated it later in the same year. [Other similarities, however (see notes on Sonnets 19, 46, 74, 141), lead Tyler to believe that Drayton was familiar with Sh.'s Sonnets as a whole.] (pp. 39–42.) FLEAY: The possession of the dark woman by the angel-man exactly corresponds to that of Drayton by his angel-woman. (*Biog. Chron.*, 2: 226.) LEE: This sonnet is adapted from Drayton. . . . But Sh. entirely alters the point of the lines by contrasting the influence exerted on him by the woman with that exerted on him by a man. (*Life*, p. 153n.) WYNDHAM: The likeness is but of phrasing, for Drayton refers only to one person, and if, as I believe, [Sonnets 127–152 were written at the same time as 33–42,] — perhaps in 1598 or the early part of 1599 — Drayton's sonnet seems just such a superficial plagiarism as are his later sonnets, published first in 1619, of Sh.'s numbers in the later groups. [See notes on 116, 5–8.] BEECHING: Both sonnets appeared in 1599, and probably one was suggested by the other, but which by which? Mr. Lee says, *tout court*, "Even this sonnet is adapted from Drayton." I should say, "Even this sonnet is adapted from Sh.!" On Mr. Lee's theory one has to believe that Sh. built up his whole sonnet subject of "a man right fair" and "a woman colour'd ill" from this germ sonnet, for which he was indebted to a suggestion from Drayton. It may have been so, but one desiderates a grain of proof. (p. 137n.) [For myself, I desiderate a grain of proof that either sonnet must have been suggested by the other. Surely the subjects are distinct; and as to phrasing, the words "evil," "spirit," and "devil," were no less familiar in Sh.'s time than now. — ED.]

KRAUSS: [Cf. Sidney, *A. & S.*, 5th Song, st. 14:]

> Yet witches may repent. Thou art far worse than they.
> Alas! that I am forc'd such evil of thee to say.
> I say thou art a devil! though cloth'd in angel's shining;
> For thy face tempts my soul to leave the heavens for thee,
> And thy words of refuse do pour even hell on me.
> Who tempt, and tempted plague, are devils in true defining.

WALSH: In *2 H. 4*, II, iv, 362–66 (supposed to have been written in 1598), there is something about a boy with "a good angel about him," but whom "the devil binds too," and a woman who "is in hell already, and burns poor souls"; which may, or not, be reminiscent.

2. **sugiest.** MALONE: Tempt. [So DOWDEN, ROLFE, TYLER, WYNDHAM, etc.] SCHMIDT: Prompt or inform underhand, whisper. BEECHING: Not necessarily "tempt," but "whisper advice," whether good or bad. [The absolute personal object favors Malone's interpretation. — ED.]

4. **collour'd ill.** [Shall space be found here to record a discovery of ACHESON's, connecting this line with his identification of the dark lady with Mistress Jane Davenant? One of the poems prefixed to *Willobie his Avisa* (see p. 478, below) opens with the line "In Lavine Land though Livie boast," and the first thirteen letters of this form the anagram "Ill Jn. Davenant." This, says Mr. Acheson, is an obvious allusion to the present passage, and the discovery provides the title of his pamphlet, "A Woman Coloured Ill."]

5. **win me soone to hell.** MASSEY: Sh.'s meaning can only be apprehended by following it according to the laws of [the old game of] Barley-Break. . . . The game turns upon breaking the law, and also on being caught and condemned to Hell. Those who are in Hell are the bad angels; those who are outside are the good. To tempt, or lure, catch or carry, the good one to Hell, the female pursues the male player. When she has caught him he must go to Hell with her and become a devil in the Hell of the bad angels. The catching is followed by kissing in Hell as it is in the game of "Kiss-in-the-Ring." And the speaker in the sonnet has a presaging fear lest this part of the game should be carried out in earnest. [See the account in the *Arcadia;* Lamon's song of Strephon and Klaius, Bk. I.] . . . [Since, according to the rules,] the "man right fair" could only be the "better angel" to a speaker who is a woman, [and] the "better angel" as a male could only be tempted from the side of a woman, . . . it is doubly impossible for the speaker to be Sh. or any other man. (pp. 135–36.) [Sidney's description is as follows:

> Then couples three be streight allotted there;
> They of both ends, the middle two doe flie,
> The two that in mid place Hell, called were,
> Must strive with waiting foot and watching eye
> To catch of them, and them to Hell to beare,
> That they, as well as they, Hell may supplie. . . .

There may you see, soone as the middle two
Doe coupled towards either couple make,
They false and fearefull do their hands undoe,
Brother his brother, friend doth friend forsake,
Heeding himselfe, cares not how fellow do,
But of a stranger mutuall help doth take.

(*Poems*, Grosart ed., 2: 134–35.)

In his note, Grosart states that, "whatever the rules under which the couple in hell attacked and pursued the couple they singled out, either of the pursued were saved by joining with one of the other out-couple of the opposite sex." It will be noticed that there is no warrant in Sidney's account for the implication that the players called themselves "angels" and "devils," and the whole analogy is very doubtful. Even if Sh. alluded in his phrasing to the terms of the game, it does not follow that he was careful to identify his three characters with persons of the appropriate sex. — ED.]

6. STEEVENS: Cf. *Oth.*, V, ii, 208: "Curse his better angel from his side." [This parallel is interesting for the suggestion that the image in the sonnet has to do with the speaker's *guardian* angel. — ED.]

9. MCCLUMPHA: Cf. *R. & J.*, III, ii, 75: "Beautiful tyrant! Fiend angelical!" (*Jahrb.*, 40: 202.)

9–10. LEE: Cf. Jodelle, *Contr' Amours*, No. 6:

Ja si long temps faisant d'un Diable un Ange
Vous m'ouvrez l'œil en l'iniuste louange,
Et m'aveuglez en l'iniuste tourment.

(*Life*, p. 122n.)

11. **from.** DOWDEN: Away from. **each.** ABBOTT: For "each other." (§ 12.)

12. SHINDLER: [A] reference to a well-known story of Boccaccio. (*Gent. Mag.*, 272: 78.) [Shindler probably refers to the tale of "putting the devil in hell," the 10th of the third day in the *Decameron*. — ED.]

14. BEECHING: The reference here, which the Elizabethans thought jocular, is made plainer by *2 H. 4*, II, iv, 365, quoted by Dowden. [See Walsh's note above.] **fire . . . out.** LEE: The expression . . . had a literary character in Sh.'s day. . . . Cf. Guilpin's *Skialetheia* (1598, ed. Grosart, p. 17): "But Ile be loth (wench) to be fired out." [Lee discusses the history of the phrase at some length in the *Ath.*, Jan. 19, 1901, p. 80. See also, in *N. & Q.*, 10th s., 8: 454, some account of it in relation to modern slang.]

[Interpreters of all schools tend to make this a "key sonnet": those who divide the collection into two "series" finding here the two persons respectively addressed; Massey finding a clue to his "dramatic" theory; and Simpson and others one to the philosophy of the Sonnets. SIMPSON says:] The two loves answer to friendship and concupiscence, the *amor amicitiae* and *amor concupiscentiae* of the schools. The former love has its revolutions, but each time it returns to itself with renewed strength. . . . The other love is the false infinite

— the eternal alternation yes and no, . . . fickle, false, and fraudulent — perverse, self-contradictory, and full of change. (p. 37.)

ROLFE: [The view that the publication of this sonnet in 1599 shows that the others dealing with the same subject were written before that time] is clearly a misinterpretation of that sonnet, which, instead of marking the end of the story, really belongs to a comparatively early stage of it. . . . The poet says that the woman "tempteth" (not, has succeeded in seducing) his friend. She "would corrupt" him, but whether she has actually done it, he adds, "Suspect I may, but not directly tell." . . . In Sonnets 34–35 he had no doubt that the "woman coloured ill" had corrupted his "better angel." (Intro., rev. ed., pp. 38–39.)

145

THOSE lips that Loues owne hand did make,
Breath'd forth the sound that said I hate,
To me that languisht for her sake:
But when she saw my wofull state,
Straight in her heart did mercie come,
Chiding that tongue that euer sweet,
Was vsde in giuing gentle dome:
And tought it thus a new to greete:
I hate she alterd with an end,
That follow'd it as gentle day,
Doth follow night who like a fiend
From heauen to hell is flowne away.
I hate, from hate away she threw,
And sau'd my life saying not you.

2. **I hate**] Italics by M, A, Kly, Co³, Hu²; quoted by Kt, Co¹,², B, Del, Hu¹, Dy, Sta, Cl, Gl, Wh, Hal, Cam, Do, R, etc.

7. **dome**] *doome* 1640, G, etc.

8. **a new**] *a-new* G, S, E, M; *anew* A, etc.

9, 13. **I hate**] Italics by G², S², E, M, A, Kly, Co³, Hu²; quoted by Kt, Co¹,², B, Del, Hu¹, Dy, Sta, Cl, Gl, Wh, Hal, Cam, Do, R, etc.

11. **fiend**] *friend* G².

13. **from . . . threw**] — *away from hate she flew* Stee conj.

14. **not you**] Italics by G², S², E, M, A, Kly, Co³, Hu²; quoted by Kt, Co¹,², B, Del, Hu¹, Dy, Sta, Cl, Gl, Wh, Hal, Cam, Do, R, etc. **you**] Italics by S¹; *yet* Hal [error].

DOWDEN: The only sonnet written in eight-syllable verses. Some critics, partly on this ground, partly because the rhymes are ill-managed, reject it as not by Sh. WYNDHAM: This sonnet . . . [has] an unpleasing assonance between the rhyme-sounds of the first quatrain, and but little in it that recalls Sh.'s hand save "That follow'd it as gentle day doth follow night." ACHESON: Sh. certainly did not write [this sonnet], nor did any one to whom the title of poet might be applied: it is possibly a flight of Southampton's own muse. (*Sh. & the R. P.*, p. 48.) BEECHING: An occasional sonnet, having no connection with the series. There is no reason to doubt its Shakespearean authorship. [See MASSEY'S note on S. 96, and MACKAIL'S on 128.] LEE: A playful lyric in octosyllabics, like Lyly's song of "Cupid and Campaspe"; its tone has close affinity to that and other of Lyly's songs. (*Life*, p. 98.) [ISAAC quotes W. KÖNIG (*Jahrb.*, 11: 137) as noting that Giordano Bruno wrote sonnets in four-foot iambics, and adds that one of Wyatt's is in the same metre. (*Archiv*, 60: 49.)]

7. **dome.** SCHMIDT: Judgment, sentence.

11. STEEVENS: Cf. *H. 5*, IV, Prol., 21: "Night who, like a foul and ugly witch," etc.

13. STEEVENS: Such sense as these sonnets abound with may perhaps be discovered as the words at present stand; but I had rather read: "*I hate* — away from hate she flew," etc., [i.e.,] Having pronounced the words "I hate," she left me with a declaration in my favour. MALONE: The meaning is — she removed the words "I hate" to a distance from hatred; she changed their natural import . . . by subjoining "not you." The old copy is certainly right. [Cf. *Lucrece*, 1534–37:]

> "It cannot be," quoth she, "that so much guile" —
> She would have said "can lurk in such a look";
> But Tarquin's shape came in her mind the while,
> And from her tongue "can lurk" from "cannot" took.

HORACE DAVIS: Cf. Longfellow's translation of *Purgatorio*, 5: 66 ("Pur che il voler nonpossa non ricida"): "Unless the I cannot cut off the I will."

BRANDL [observes that this sonnet is addressed to a good-natured sweetheart — wholly different from the dark lady. He finds pleasure in reflecting that there was one worthy soul in London "for whom Sh. warmed with tenderness." (pp. xxv, xix.)]

146

Poore soule the center of my sinfull earth,
My sinfull earth these rebbell powres that thee array,
Why dost thou pine within and suffer dearth
Painting thy outward walls so costlie gay?
Why so large cost hauing so short a lease,
Dost thou vpon thy fading mansion spend?
Shall wormes inheritors of this excesse
Eate vp thy charge? is this thy bodies end?
Then soule liue thou vpon thy seruants losse,
And let that pine to aggrauat thy store;
Buy tearmes diuine in selling houres of drosse:
Within be fed, without be rich no more,
So shalt thou feed on death, that feeds on men,
And death once dead, ther's no more dying then,

1. **center**] *tenant* Sebastian Evans conj.

2. **My . . . these**] *Fool'd by those* M, A, Co, B, Hu[1], Kly; *Fool'd by these* Kt, Del, Dy, Sta, Cl, Wh[1], Hal, Ox; *Starv'd by the* Stee conj.; *Starv'd by these* But; *Thrall to these* Kinnear conj., N, Wa; *Slave of these* Cartwright; *Leagued with these* Brae conj., Hu[2]; *Foil'd by these* Palgrave conj., Massey conj.; *Hemm'd with these* Furnivall conj.; *Press'd by these* Do, R; *Why feed'st these* Ty; *Sport of these* Sharp; *Lord of these* Her conj.; *Feeding these* Sebastian Evans conj.; *Spoil'd by these* Spence conj.; *Vex'd by these* Rushton conj.; *My sins, those* Bulloch conj.; *Sinful thro'* Nicholson conj.; . . . *these* Gl, Cam, Wh[2], Her, Be. **rebbell powres**] *powers* C. **that thee array**] *array* Massey conj., Wy, Bull. **array**] *aray* 1640, G[1], Hu[2]; *warray* Sebastian Evans conj., Guiney conj.

4. **walls**] *wall* Wa. **so**] *in* 1640, G. **so costlie gay**] *in costly clay* S, E.

6. **fading**] *faded* S, E.

7. **inheritors**] *in heritors* 1640; *in Herriots* G[2].

10. **thy**] *my* L.

C. A. Brown: An address to his own soul, the solemn nature of which cannot be regarded as congruous with the rest. [This sonnet and 145 should be expunged from the poem constituted by 127–152.] [See Massey's note on 129, for his view of the two sonnets as a pair suggested by two of Sidney's. The second of Sidney's is as follows:]

Leave me, O love! which reachest but to dust!
And thou, my mind! aspire to higher things!

Grow rich in that which never taketh rust!
Whatever fades but fading pleasure brings.
Draw in thy beams, and humble all thy might
To that sweet yoke where lasting freedoms be!
Which breaks the clouds, and opens forth the light
That doth both shine and give us sight to see.
O take fast hold! Let that light be thy guide!
In this small course which birth draws out to death:
And think how evil becometh him to slide,
Who seeketh heaven, and comes of heavenly breath!
Then farewell, world! Thy uttermost I see!
Eternal Love, maintain thy love in me!

SIMPSON [also compares this sonnet with Sidney's, and adds that its phraseology recalls that of Chaucer's "recantation" at the close of the *Canterbury Tales*:] "This blisful regne may men purchace by poverte espirituel, and the glorie by loweness, the plente of joye by hunger and thurst, and the rest by travaile, and the life by deth and mortificacioun of synne." (p. 73.) MAIN [notes other sonnets of similar religious tone: Barnes, 49 and 97 of the *Divine Century:* Griffin, 27 and 29 of *Fidessa;* Davies, 13 of *Wit's Pilgrimage;* and one of Breton's *Soul's Harmony* (Grosart ed., p. 5), beginning, "The worldly prince doth in his sceptre hold."] FURNIVALL [describes the sonnet as] a remonstrance with himself on spending too much, either on dress or outward self-indulgence, and exhorting himself to give it up for inward culture. (Intro., p. lxvi.) TYLER [even more definitely makes his interpretation secular; see his note on line 11.] ROLFE: Eminently a religious sonnet, though it seems to have been misunderstood by Tyler. BRANDL [connects the sonnet with 144, finding in it the poet's solution of the problem of choice between good and evil. Like the old man in Marlowe's *Faustus*, who lost his body to the devil but saved his soul, so Sh. hopes that his soul will live through its "servant's loss." (p. xxv.)] G. H. PALMER [also treats the sonnet as an integral part of the series, — as fitted, indeed, to stand as the conclusion of the whole, and as related to the dark-lady group, since it is precisely "in the intensity and bewilderment of sin" that "the possibility of a spiritual immortality is revealed."] Sh. saw his passions to be matters of a moment, and so by contrast became aware of an imperial Self which could not be subjected to temporary influences without shame. . . . Was he true to that deep insight? . . . Or did he lose himself again in solicitations of the flesh? Who but himself can say? Once at least, we know, he looked into immortality. (pp. 47, 56, 57.)

1. MALONE: Cf. *R. & J.*, II, i, 1–2:

Can I go forward when my heart is here?
Turn back, dull earth, and find thy centre out;

and *M.V.*, V, i, 63–65:

Such harmony is in immortal souls;
But whilst this muddy vesture of decay
Doth grossly close it in, we cannot hear it.

2. The textual notes tell their own sad story of the succession of editorial labors on this line. MALONE: It is manifest that the composer inadvertently repeated the last three words of the first verse in the beginning of the second, omitting two syllables, which are sufficient to complete the metre. What the omitted word or words were, it is impossible now to determine. Rather than leave an hiatus, I have hazarded a conjecture. STEEVENS: I would read "Starv'd by," etc. The dearth complained of in the succeeding line appears to authorise the conjecture. The poet seems to allude to the short commons and gaudy habit of soldiers. INGLEBY [discusses the line at length, especially in defence of his interpretation of "array" as "afflict, ill-treat." Malone's emendation is untenable, because it implies that the rebel powers stultify the soul in the matter of her raiment; on the contrary, the soul herself is said to deck and paint her tenement, not herself. The leading words seem to have a direct application to the proximate substantive, "earth," and the second line should be a justification of the expression "sinful earth." Hence Brae's emendation, "Leagu'd with," is preferable, because it implies that the earth is the accomplice of the rebel powers: the flesh and its lusts are leagued in the work of defrauding the soul of her rightful nutriment. (*The Soule Arayed*, passim.) FURNIVALL, for his conjecture, "Hemmed," cites *V. & A.*, 1022, "Hemm'd with thieves." (Intro., p. lxvi.)] DOWDEN: What is the meaning of "array"? Does it mean to put raiment on? . . . There is no doubt that the word "aray" or "array" was used in [the sense of "abuse," "afflict," according to Ingleby], by Elizabethan writers, and Sh., *T. of S.*, III, ii, 53 and IV, 1, 3, uses "raied," though nowhere "aray," except perhaps here, in this or a kindred sense. . . . In support of the general opinion that "array" means invest in raiment, cf. *M.V.*, V, i, 64 [quoted above]. The "rebel powers" and the "outward walls" perhaps receive some illustration from the following lines, *Lucrece*, 722–26:

> She says her subjects with foul insurrection
> Have batter'd down her consecrated wall,
> And by their mortal fault brought in subjection
> Her immortality, and made her thrall
> To living death and pain perpetual.

. . . Some emendation being necessary, I suggest "Pressed by." Cf. 139, 8. KINNEAR [cites the passage quoted by Dowden from *Lucrece* (line 725) in support of the emendation "Thrall'd." (*Cruces*, p. 503.)] ROLFE: [Dowden's conjecture] is on the whole as good a guess as any that has been made. . . . We prefer [the interpretation of Ingleby] to that which makes "array" = clothe — which seems to us forced and unnatural here — but we should prefer Massey's "set their battle in array against" to either, if any other example of this meaning could be found. Perhaps the turn thus given to the military sense is no more remarkable than the liberties Sh. takes with sundry other words; and here the exigencies of the rhyme might justify it. VERITY: I think that "array" must mean clothe; the body is the vesture which encloses the soul, and the soul says, with St. Paul, "Who will deliver me from the body of this

death?" MASSEY [having in his first work proposed to read, "My sinful earth these rebel powers array," in his second work (*The Secret Drama*) proposes "Foiled by" etc., seemingly unaware that it had already been proposed by Palgrave. He finds the word suggested by Sidney's poem beginning "If I could think how these my thoughts to leave":

> If rebel sense would reason's law receive,
> Or reason foiled would not in vain contend.]

Here the "rebel sense" presents the original of the "rebel powers," and "reason foiled" suggests the right word at last. (p. 226n.) TYLER [defending the emendation "Why feed'st"]: The principal subject is manifestly the feeding of the body and soul; and the conclusion come to is, that the latter, and not the former, is to be fed. . . . Moreover, the "my" of line 1 and the "why" commencing alike lines 2 and 3 may have been the cause of confusion and error. Then, too, there is a verse of Southwell's "Content and Ritche" which Sh. may have had in view:

> Spare diett is my fare,
> My clothes more fitt than fine;
> I knowe I feede and cloth a foe
> That pamprd would repine.

B. NICHOLSON, [(*N. & Q.*, 7th s., 11: 364), defends his emendation, "Sinful, thro'," on the ground that the most probable cause of the compositor's mistaken repetition of the three words is that *one* of them was repeated in the MS. The poet's earth is sinful not merely through hereditary taint, but through *her*, because of the charms that the devil and his angels had given her. In 12: 423 C. C. B. objects to this, on the ground that it is not conceivable that the sonnet is addressed to the dark lady.] WYNDHAM: Massey's emendation [of "powers array"] has the merit of adding nothing to the text, and of restoring euphony to one of the finest among Sh.'s sonnets. There is warrant for repeating the last words of a preceding line; cf. 142, 1–2; 90, 1–2; *V. & A.*, 963–64:

> Both crystals, where they view'd each other's sorrow,
> Sorrow that friendly sighs sought still to dry.

. . . There may well, as so often in the Sonnets, be double meaning in the word ["array":] (1) beleaguer, afflict; (2) adorn. BEECHING: The difficulty is increased by the uncertainty of what was the image in the poet's mind. It seems at first to be that of a castle besieged by rebels, as in *Lucrece*, 722–23; then it changes to that of a mansion with an improvident householder. If "array" can mean "hem in like a besieging army," we could read equally well "Lord of," or "Thrall to," or "Starv'd by." [Massey's and Wyndham's reading does not account for the words "that thee"; and in the parallel repetitions cited by Wyndham there is none of more than a single word.] PORTER: The repetition is so poetically effective that it seems intentional. . . . The extra foot, though it may have been an oversight, lends an explicitness needed as to the array of the body's powers . . . against the soul; and the repetition adds an emphasis

to the further explicitness. Miss L. I. GUINEY [(*N. & Q.*, 11th s., 4: 84), apparently not knowing of its having been long since proposed by Sebastian Evans, proposes "warray" for "array," in the sense of invade and beleaguer; cf. *F.Q.*, bk. i, c. 5, st. 48: "That first the world with sword and fire warrayed"; and *Selimus*, "The earth with unknown armour did warray." That a soul can be fooled, or foiled, or hurt by rebel powers *warraying* her, is eminently intelligible, and is built on a magnificent metaphor. Miss Guiney also suspects that "centre" (line 1) may be for "centrie" = sentry; but the word is not used by Sh., and if the spelling of the Q, "center," had been noticed, the suggestion might not have been made.] LEE: [For "array"] the ordinary meaning of "clothe" or "adorn" seems alone consistent with the "costly gay" ornament in which, according to line 4, the powers of sin have invested the soul's external home. [For the meaning "trouble, afflict," see *N. E. D.*, s. v., 10, 5, where is quoted *The Passion of Christ* (ab. 1600): "Vyce, . . . Whiche hathe hym so Encombered and arayed." No evidence is given for the meaning "beleaguer" or "besiege." — ED.]

4. WYNDHAM: Cf. *Macb.*, V, v, 1: "Hang out our banners on the outward walls." BEECHING: There seems reason to suppose that this idea was in the poet's mind, but that he modified the expression in order to suit the human body rather than the castle with which he was comparing it. SARRAZIN [finds here evidence that Sh. had been in Italy, as the practice of painting the exterior of buildings was unknown in England. (*Jahrb.*, 31: 229.)]

5. **short a lease.** Cf. 124, 10.

7–8. TYLER: Cf. *Haml.*, IV, iii, 23: "We fat all creatures else to fat us, and we fat ourselves for maggots"; and V, i, 99: "Did these bones cost no more the breeding, but to play at loggats with 'em?"

8. **charge.** SCHMIDT: Expense. TYLER: What has cost thee so much.

9. PORTER: The royal right of the Soul is to live by the body's service, and by its defeat and at its expense to outlive it.

9–14. J. M. ROBERTSON: An echo of much of Montaigne's discourse. . . . It more particularly echoes two passages in the 19th essay: "There is no evil in life for him that hath well conceived how the privation of life is no evil. To know how to die, doth free us from all subjection and constraint." "No man did ever prepare himself to quit the world more simply and fully . . . than I am fully assured I shall do. The deadest deaths are the best." (*Sh. & Montaigne*, p. 162.)

10. WALSH: Cf. *L. L. L.*, I, i, 25: "The mind shall banquet, though the body pine." **aggravat.** SCHMIDT: Make greater. **thy.** MALONE: The error that has been so often already noticed, has happened here; the original copy, and all the subsequent impressions, reading "my." [Here Homer nodded rather strangely; for not only is the error in question confined to the Lintott volume, but the error of "my" for "thy" has *not* been often noticed in the Sonnets. As the Cambridge editors remark, the Bodleian copy of Q, which belonged to Malone himself, reads "thy." It was doubtless Malone's note which led COLLIER to say that *some* of the copies of Q read "my store."]

11. **tearmes divine.** SCHMIDT [glosses "divine" as "holy."] WALKER: "Terms" in the legal and academic sense: long periods of time, opposed to hours. [Cf. 92, 2. — ED.] TYLER: To be understood most probably of immortal renown, which is to be purchased by sacrificing a few years of life to intent study and enthusiastic literary work. VERITY: I think "terms" means conditions, as though it were the terms of some bargain and compact between soul and body. BEECHING: "Terms divine" = eternity. [This last is undoubtedly right; "heavenly periods" (literally) are opposed to "hours of dross." — ED.]

12. **rich.** MASSEY [finds here a pun on the name of Lady Penelope Rich, as in Sidney's *A. & S.* (p. 238.) This is also the view of HENRY BROWN (p. 232.)]

13. **feed on death.** BEECHING: By withdrawing food from what dies and so diminishing the diet of death, we are said to "feed on death."

14. FURNIVALL: He declares his belief in the immortality of the soul. [Cf. Donne, Sonnet 10:

> One short sleep past, we wake eternally,
> And Death shall be no more; Death, thou shalt die.
>
> — ED.]

This sonnet was translated into Latin verse by E. D. S., *N. & Q.*, 10th s., 1: 204.

147

My loue is as a feauer longing still,
For that which longer nurseth the disease,
Feeding on that which doth preserue the ill,
Th'vncertaine sicklie appetite to please:
My reason the Phisition to my loue,
Angry that his prescriptions are not kept
Hath left me, and I desperate now approoue,
Desire is death, which Phisick did except.
Past cure I am, now Reason is past care,
And frantick madde with euer-more vnrest,
My thoughts and my discourse as mad mens are,
At randon from the truth vainely exprest.
For I haue sworne thee faire, and thought thee bright,
Who art as black as hell, as darke as night.

2. **disease**] *decease* E.

4. **Th'vncertaine**] *The uncertain* M, A, Kt, B, Del, Cl, Gl, Kly, Cam, Do, R, Wh², But, Her, Ox, Be, N. **vncertaine sicklie**] Hyphened by Del, Sta, Dy², Hu².

7. **desperate**] (*desperate*) C. **approoue,**] *approoue.* L; *approve.* S¹, Co³; *approve*; G, S², E; *approve,* — C; *approve* Kt, Dy, Sta, Cl, Gl, Cam, Do, etc.

9. **care**] *cure* G, S, E.

10. **frantick madde**] Hyphened by M, B, Del, Dy, Sta, Gl, Cam, Co³, Do, Hu², R, Wh², Wy, etc.

12. **randon**] *randome* 1640, etc.

Isaac [discusses the parallel treatment of love as a disease or madness, noting Petrarch, *Triumph of Love*, 3d Song, v. 106, and *Epist. Poet.*, 1, 7; Michelangelo, S. 36; a sonnet of Giordano Bruno's (see *Jahrb.*, 11: 136); Lodge, *Phillis*, S. 26; Drayton, *Idea*, S. 41 ("Love's Lunacy"); etc. In Sh.'s own works, cf. S. 119; *L. L. L.*, IV, iii, 95; *M. for M.*, I, ii, 132–34; *Cor.*, I, i, 182. Cf. also Plato in the *Phædrus, passim.* (*Archiv*, 61: 191–93.)] Krauss: Cf. Sidney, *A. & S.*, 5th Song, l. 78: "No witchcraft is so evil, as which man's mind destroyeth."

[Mr. Horace Davis notes the resemblance of this sonnet to Sonnets 118–119. Cf. especially the repetition of the notions "fever," "disease," "appetite," "prescriptions" ("medicine").]

3–4. Dowden [is able to persuade himself that these lines furnish a link with 146, 12–13.]

5. MALONE: [Cf. *M. W. W.*, II, i, 5, in Farmer's reading: "Though Love use Reason for his physician," — the Folio reading "precisian."] MASSEY: Cf. Sidney, "If rebel sense would reason's law receive." [In the poem beginning, "If I could think how these my thoughts to leave," 1598.]

7. **approove.** Cf. 70, 5. BEECHING: Find by experience. [The impression of the comma following this word in some copies looks much like a period, and it is so described by the Cambridge editors; this may account for the reading in Lintott's edition. — ED.]

7–8. DOWDEN: I, who am desperate, now experience that desire which did object to physic, is death.

8. **except.** SCHMIDT: Object to.

9. MALONE: A proverbial saying. [Cf. *L. L. L.*, V, ii, 28: "Great reason; for past cure is still past care"; and *Holland's Leaguer* (1632): "She has got this adage in her mouth: 'Things past cure, past care.'"]

14. STEEVENS: Cf. *L. L. L.*, IV, iii, 254–55:

> Black is the badge of hell,
> The hue of dungeons and the suit of night.

TYLER: Cf. 131, 12–14.

[My friend Professor H. D. GRAY observes:] The bitterness of this and Sonnets 150–152 could scarcely be due to the same cause as that which led Sh. to the *dénoûment* of his series 40–42. Compare the concluding couplets of 42 and the present sonnet. They cannot belong to the same story — at least not in the same stage of that story.

[On the vituperative element, cf. LEE'S notes under S. 127, and further as follows:] Every sonneteer of the 16th century, at some point in his career, devoted his energies to vituperation of a cruel siren. Ronsard in his sonnets celebrated in language quite as furious as Sh.'s a "fierce tigress," a "murderess," a "Medusa." . . . In Sh.'s early life the convention was wittily parodied by Gabriel Harvey in "An Amorous Odious sonnet intituled The Student's Loove or Hatrid, or both or neither, or what shall please the looving or hating reader, either in sport or earnest, to make of such contrary passions as are here discoursed." [Cf. also the *Contr' Amours* of Jodelle, quoted under 137 and 144.] The dark lady of Sh.'s sonnets may therefore be relegated to the ranks of the creatures of his fancy. It is quite possible that he may have met in real life a dark-complexioned siren, and it is possible that he may have fared ill at her disdainful hands. But . . . it was the exacting conventions of the sonneteering contagion, and not his personal experiences or emotions, that impelled Sh. to give "the dark lady" of his sonnets a poetic being. (*Life*, pp. 121–23.)

E. S. BATES: Sh.'s attack upon the morality of his mistress [is wholly un-Petrarchistic]. Mr. Lee has indeed cited a number of alleged parallelisms from poems of Ronsard and others calling their mistresses "tigresses" and "Medusas" because of their hard hearts, but the cases are not in point, since these remonstrances are caused by the immovable chastity of the mistress, while in Sh. they are caused by her fickle unchastity. (*Mod. Philology*, 8: 17.)

148

O ME! what eyes hath loue put in my head,
Which haue no correspondence with true sight,
Or if they haue, where is my iudgment fled,
That censures falsely what they see aright?
If that be faire whereon my false eyes dote,
What meanes the world to say it is not so?
If it be not, then loue doth well denote,
Loues eye is not so true as all mens: no,
How can it? O how can loues eye be true,
That is so vext with watching and with teares?
No maruaile then though I mistake my view,
The sunne it selfe sees not, till heauen cleeres.
O cunning loue, with teares thou keepst me blinde,
Least eyes well seeing thy foule faults should finde.

7. **loue**] *that* Lettsom conj., Hu².

8. **eye**] *ay* [italics] Co³. **all mens**] *mens* E. **mens: no**] *men's no.* Walker-Lettsom conj., Dy², Co³, Hu², R [*no* in italics in Co³]; *men's "No."* Gl, Wh².

[See note at the end of S. 137, on its connection with this and the following sonnets.]

MASSEY: [Cf. Sidney's sonnet in *Arcadia* (Poems, Grosart ed., 2: 87):]

> Transform'd in show, but more transform'd in mind,
> I cease to strive, with double conquest foiled;
> For (woe is me!) my powers all I find
> With outward force and inward treason spoiled. [etc.]
>
> (p. 248.)

ISAAC: Cf. *M. N. D.*, I, i, 232–37:

> Things base and vile, holding no quantity,
> Love can transpose to form and dignity.
> Love looks not with the eyes but with the mind,
> And therefore is wing'd Cupid painted blind.
> Nor hath Love's mind of any judgement taste;
> Wings and no eyes figure unheedy haste.

WALSH: Cf. *T. & C.*, V, ii, 110–112:

> The error of our eye directs our mind.
> What error leads must err; O, then conclude
> Minds sway'd by eyes are full of turpitude.

VON MAUNTZ: Cf. Ovid, *Metam.*, vii, 20–21: "Video meliora proboque: deteriora sequar."

4. **censures.** MALONE: Estimates.

7. **denote.** SCHMIDT: Indicate.

7–8. TYLER: The sense may be, that the fact of a man's being in love is sufficient evidence (sufficiently "denotes") that he cannot see aright.

8. WALKER: Ought we not to affix a longer stop to "no"? Otherwise the flow seems not to be Shakespearian. LETTSOM: Ought we to stop here? Ought we not to expunge the colon before "no," and write "as all men's no"? Sh. seems to intend a pun on *eye* and I, i.e., *ay*. STAUNTON: We believe with Lettsom that a quibble was intended, and that the poet wrote, "Love's eye (I = aye) is not so true as all men's no." WYNDHAM: This exquisite piece of punctuation in Q has been frequently destroyed by emendation. [To this PERCY SIMPSON agrees, regarding the punctuation as important for a "passage of exceptional beauty." (*Sh. Punctuation*, p. 9.)] BEECHING: Probably the pun belongs to the second "eye" in line 9, and line 8 should read, "Love's 'ay' is not so true as all men's 'no.'" The punctuation, howeevr, of Q is so unusually precise that I have not ventured to change it. LEE: No particular sanctity attaches to this perplexing punctuation of the Q. The colon looks like a typographical superfluity and may well take the place of the comma after "no." A pun . . . seems obviously intended. [A respectable pun must have a meaning on each side of it, and it does not seem to have occurred to the commentators who find one here to provide such a meaning for a line with the "eye" standing in it. (Beeching, of course, avoids this objection by introducing the pun in the following line only.) Moreover, is it not rather pointless to read, "Love's affirmative is not so true as all men's negative?" Whereas "Love's eye is more inaccurate than that of any man" is just the meaning needed. I shall not undertake to defend this position on purely textual grounds; for it is quite true, as Lee observes, that the punctuation of the Q is far from sacred, and the rhythm of "mens: no," while it may be "exquisite," is very exceptional. — ED.]

9–10. SARRAZIN: Cf. *R. 3*, I, ii, 167: "Made them blind with weeping." (*Sh.'s Lehrjahre*, p. 155.)

12. MCCLUMPHA: Cf. *R. & J.*, II, iii, 73: "The sun not yet thy sighs from heaven clears." (*Jahrb.*, 40: 196.)

13. **love.** DOWDEN: He is perhaps speaking of his mistress, but if so, he identifies her with Love, — views her as Love personified. TYLER: There is manifestly some distinction between the "Love" here spoken of [and in line 1] and the "Love" of lines 8–9.

149

CANST thou O cruell, say I loue thee not,
When I against my selfe with thee pertake:
Doe I not thinke on thee when I forgot
Am of my selfe, all tirant for thy sake?
Who hateth thee that I doe call my friend,
On whom froun'st thou that I doe faune vpon,
Nay if thou lowrst on me doe I not spend
Reuenge vpon my selfe with present mone?
What merrit do I in my selfe respect,
That is so proude thy seruice to dispise,
When all my best doth worship thy defect,
Commanded by the motion of thine eyes.
But loue hate on for now I know thy minde,
Those that can see thou lou'st, and I am blind.

3. **I forgot**] *I, forgot,* Wa.
4. **Am**] *All* S, E. **my selfe,**] *myself* But, Wa. **all tirant**] *all, tyrant,* S¹, C; *all tyrant,* M, A, Kt, Co, B, Del, Hu, Dy, Sta, Cl, Gl, Wh, Hal, Cam, Do, R, Ty, Ox, Her, N, Wa; *all-tyrant,* Hazlitt, Kly, Be; *all truant* M conj.
5. **hateth thee**] *hateth thou* G¹; *hatest thou* S, E. **I doe**] *do I* G¹, S¹. **friend,**] *friend?* G², S², etc.
6. **vpon**] *upon?* G², etc.
12. **eyes.**] *eyes?* G², S², etc.

ISAAC: Who would not think [in reading this sonnet], of the third scene of Act I of *A. & C.*, which has precisely the same situation as a basis?

2. **pertake.** STEEVENS: Take part.
4. **all tirant.** See textual notes. MALONE: For the sake of thee, thou tyrant. DOWDEN: Thou complete tyrant! TYLER: When I . . . am reckless of my own interests, and thus play the tyrant towards myself. [Yet Tyler keeps the comma after "tyrant"; and he admits the possibility of referring the word to the lady, in view of "cruel" in line 1.] WYNDHAM: The Q reading is almost certainly correct; and the plain sense is: "I forget myself, a tyrant to myself for your sake." [So BUTLER and PORTER.] BEECHING: [Wyndham's] paraphrase omits "all," which has no force as applied to the poet. ROLFE: Possibly vocative. [If the comma is omitted after "tyrant," and the word is referred to the speaker, I should prefer to read it as explained by line 2 (a little differently from Tyler):

tyrannically cruel — like you — to myself; or, in like manner, explained by the second quatrain, — cruel to everyone on whom you frown. — Ed.]

5. Cf. 89, 14.

5–6. Simpson: Cf. *H. 8*, II, iv, 27–33:

> When was the hour
> I ever contradicted your desire,
> Or made it not mine too? Or which of your friends
> Have I not strove to love, although I knew
> He were mine enemy? What friend of mine
> That had to him deriv'd your anger, did I
> Continue in my liking?

12. Tyler: Cf. Sonnets 132, 139.

14. Massey: Cf. Sidney, *A. & S.*, 62: "That love she did, but lov'd a love not blind." (p. 247.)

Isaac: The last four lines . . . indicate that the poet is no longer sinking hopelessly in his passion, but already begins to view it objectively; so that this sonnet, despite all its fervour, is to be looked at as the beginning of the end of the connection. (*Archiv*, 60: 52.)

150

Oh from what powre hast thou this powrefull might,
With insufficiency my heart to sway,
To make me giue the lie to my true sight,
And swere that brightnesse doth not grace the day?
Whence hast thou this becomming of things il,
That in the very refuse of thy deeds,
There is such strength and warrantise of skill,
That in my minde thy worst all best exceeds?
Who taught thee how to make me loue thee more,
The more I heare and see iust cause of hate,
Oh though I loue what others doe abhor,
With others thou shouldst not abhor my state.
If thy vnworthinesse raisd loue in me,
More worthy I to be belou'd of thee.

2. **sway,**] *sway?* G¹, M, etc.

8. **best**] *bests* G, S.

10. **cause**] *chuse* G¹. **hate,**] *hate?* G, etc.

[With this, and the related sonnets, VON MAUNTZ compares Ovid, *Amores*, III, xi, 43–48:]

Facta merent odium, facies exorat amorem:
Me miserum! vitiis plus valet illa suis!
Parce, per o lecti socialia jura, per omnes,
Qui dant fallendos se tibi saepe, deos,
Perque tuam faciem, magni mihi numinis instar,
Perque tuos oculos, qui rapuere meos!

[Marlowe's translation:

Her deeds gain hate, her face entreateth love;
Ah, she doth more worth than her vices prove.
Spare me, O by our fellow bed, by all
The gods who by thee to be perjur'd fall,
And by thy face, to me a power divine,
And by thine eyes whose radiance burns out mine!]

2. **insufficiency.** SCHMIDT: Incompetency. DOWDEN: Defects. [The only other occurrence of the word in Sh. is in *M. N. D.*, II, ii, 128:

Is't not enough, is't not enough, young man,
That I did never, no, nor never can,
Deserve a sweet look from Demetrius' eye,
But you must flout my insufficiency?

— a passage which seems to support Dowden's gloss. The choice of the word here, however, would seem to be due to its meaning "absence of power," "impotency." "This is the paradox of your 'powerful might,' that you rule by qualities which elsewhere would appear to be the want of might." — ED.]

4. STEEVENS: Cf. *R. & J.*, III, v, 18–19:

I am content, if thou wilt have it so:
I'll say yon grey is not the morning's eye.

5. **becomming.** SCHMIDT: Grace. [Cf. *A. & C.*, I, iii, 96: "My becomings kill me when they do not eye well to you."] MALONE: Cf. *A. & C.*, II, ii, 244: "Vilest things become themselves in her"; and ibid., I, i, 49: "Fie, wrangling queen! whom everything becomes."

5–8. F. V. HUGO: Cf. Molière, *Le Misanthrope*, II, v:

L'amour, pour l'ordinaire, est peu fait à ces lois,
Et l'on voit les amants vanter toujours leurs choix. . . .
Ils comptent les défauts pour des perfections.

7. **warrantise.** SCHMIDT: Pledge. TYLER: Evidence.

9–10. MALONE: Cf. Catullus, 85:

Odi et amo; quare id faciam, fortasse requiris:
Nescio, sed fieri sentio et excrucior.

[and Terence, *Eunuchus*, 70–73]:

> O indignum facinus! nunc ego
> Et illam scelestam esse et me miserum sentio;
> Et taedet, et amore ardeo, et prudens, sciens,
> Vivus, vidensque pereo, nec quid agam scio.

[ISAAC makes this sonnet the basis for an interesting excursus on Sh.'s women, emphasizing especially its suggestiveness in connection with Cleopatra. (*Archiv*, 60: 55–61.)]

151

LOVE is too young to know what conscience is,
Yet who knowes not conscience is borne of loue,
Then gentle cheater vrge not my amisse,
Least guilty of my faults thy sweet selfe proue.
For thou betraying me, I doe betray
My nobler part to my grose bodies treason,
My soule doth tell my body that he may,
Triumph in loue, flesh staies no farther reason,
But rysing at thy name doth point out thee,
As his triumphant prize, proud of this pride,
He is contented thy poore drudge to be
To stand in thy affaires, fall by thy side.
No want of conscience hold it that I call,
Her loue, for whose deare loue I rise and fall.

2. **loue,**] *love?* G, etc.
6. **grose**] *great* Bo.
8. **farther**] *further* Hu, Ox.
10. **this**] *his* E, Walker conj.
13. **hold**] *holds* Wh², N [error; not Tu].
14. **loue**] Italics by Co³, Hu²; quoted by Dy, Sta, Cl, Gl, Cam, Do, R, etc.

[MASSEY, with what Dowden calls "unhappy ingenuity," interprets this sonnet as based on Sidney's *A. & S.*, 91, the theme (in Sidney's words, "you in them I love") being that the poet is betrayed into sin with others by his mistress's image. (pp. 247–48.)]

WYNDHAM: A piece of amatorious argument. The reference to "conscience" in lines 1, 2, 13 suggests that it was written in reply to an appeal, probably playful, addressed to the poet's conscience.

1. MASSEY: Cf. Sidney, *A. & S.*, 73: "Love still a boy and oft a wanton is." (p. 250.)

2. DOWDEN: Cf. *M. W. W.*, V, v, 32: "Why, now is Cupid a child of conscience." [The similarity of these passages, even though contradictory, suggests that there may be an allusion to some current proverb, of which, however, I know no evidence. — ED.]

3. **cheater.** STAUNTON: Escheator, an official who appears to have been regarded by the common people in Sh.'s day much the same as they now look upon an informer. DOWDEN: The more obvious meaning "rogue" makes better sense. SCHMIDT: Swindler. **amisse.** Cf. 35, 7.

8. PORTER: This and other such expressions in this sonnet have caused it to be taken merely in a fleshly sense. While all that such expressions suggest underlies the phraseology, they constitute but a metaphor of the deeper sense. This sense asserts the triumph and rise of love by the subservience to it of the body. [This is, on the whole, the most remarkable of all the examples of the process of viewing Sh. as meaning two different things at the same time. — ED.]

9. **thy name.** [TYLER and BRANDL are disposed to think this implies a punning allusion, in the sonnet, to the lady's name.]

10. **triumphant.** SCHMIDT: Victorious (the prize of his triumph). **pride.** TYLER: Proud conquest, alluding most likely to the lady's rank.

14. **rise and fall.** TYLER: Rise in the triumph of the flesh, and fall in the subjugation and humiliation of the soul. ROLFE: [This paraphrase] is too serious for the general tone of the sonnet, which is the only one in the series which is frankly and realistically gross.

ISAAC: It goes without saying that this sonnet was written earlier than S. 129. (*Archiv*, 60: 45.)

152

In louing thee thou know'st I am forsworne,
But thou art twice forsworne to me loue swearing,
In act thy bed-vow broake and new faith torne,
In vowing new hate after new loue bearing:
But why of two othes breach doe I accuse thee,
When I breake twenty: I am periur'd most,
For all my vowes are othes but to misuse thee:
And all my honest faith in thee is lost.
For I haue sworne deepe othes of thy deepe kindnesse:
Othes of thy loue, thy truth, thy constancie,
And to inlighten thee gaue eyes to blindnesse,
Or made them swere against the thing they see.
For I haue sworne thee faire: more periurde eye,
To swere against the truth so foule a lie.

2. me loue swearing] *me, Love-swearing* S1.
6. twenty:] *twenty?* G, etc.
13. eye] *I* S, etc. (except Wa).

2–4. ISAAC [would omit the comma after "swearing," reading: Thou art twice forsworn, (1) to me love swearing in act, etc.; (2) new faith torn, etc. (*Archiv*, 60: 37.)] FLEAY [would punctuate:]

> But thou art twice forsworn to me (love) swearing;
> In act — thy bedvow broke and new faith torn;
> In vowing — new hate after new love bearing.
>
> (*Biog. Chron.*, 2: 223.)

3. **In act.** TYLER: As the words are commonly regarded, they are unsuitable and superfluous. If, however, in accordance with Elizabethan usage, we take these words as meaning "in fact," "in reality," much light is thrown on the place. [Cf. *Oth.*, I, i, 150–52:

> For he's embark'd
> With such loud reason to the Cyprus wars,
> Which even now stands in act.]

. . . Says Iago, "The appointment is already as good as made; it 'even now stands *in act.*'" . . . Similarly, in the Sonnet — taking "in act" as equivalent to "in reality," "in fact" — Sh.'s mistress had broken her marriage vow *in act*, though she may have alleged that the marriage was set aside, or was treated as

null and void. [All this with reference to an hypothetical early marriage of Mrs. Fitton.] (*Academy*, Dec. 15, 1888, p. 389.) **bed-vow broake.** [See note following S. 142.] ROLFE: This seems to imply that the lady was married, but "bed-vow" may possibly refer to her illicit relations with the poet, to whom she had pledged a "faith unfaithful, falsely true." . . . It is singular that elsewhere in the Sonnets we should find no reference to a husband if she had one. FLEAY: I take the "bedvow broke" to mean, not her unfaithfulness to her husband, but her refusal to fulfil a promised assignation with Sh. (*Biog. Chron.*, 2: 223.)

3–5. WYNDHAM: This reference to a double infidelity shows that the Dark Lady, who had broken her bed-vow, soon also broke off her "new faith" with the friend. The numbers of the Second Series were written at the same time as Group C (33–42), and on the same theme. That group is but episodical in the First Series; and . . . it seems probable, from the tenor of the two main discourses of the Second Series, that the friend, after an explanation from the poet, so acted as to lead the Dark Lady to break off her "new faith" and to enter on a *reintegratio amoris* with the customary argument that it was her lover, and not she, who had been remiss in love [cf. 149, 1]. BEECHING: The breach of "new faith" is in vowing "new hate" to the poet. There is no reference to breaking off the intrigue with the friend.

7. **misuse.** SCHMIDT: Speak falsely of, misrepresent. [There is no Shakespearean parallel for this meaning of the word; but it may be taken as a kind of ironic variant of the meaning "speak ill of," as in *A. Y. L.*, IV, i, 204: "You have simply misus'd our sex." — ED.]

9. **kindnesse.** SCHMIDT: Affection, tenderness.

9–10. WALSH: We possess no sonnets expressing such praise, unless some usually applied to the friend belong to her (e.g., 105).

11. DOWDEN: To see thee in the brightness of imagination I gave away my eyes to blindness, made myself blind. WYNDHAM: To shed a more favourable light on thee, I shut my eyes.

13. **eye.** See textual notes. WYNDHAM: [The Q] may be correct, with a play on the two words "I . . . eye," since it follows on line 12. PORTER: The reference is to the eye of sense and "eyes" of line 11, now forsworn by himself. WALSH: Here the sonnets leave the mistress and Sh.'s love for her — with a bad pun. How he recovered from his "fever" we are not told; perhaps he sonneted and punned himself out of it.

ISAAC: [This sonnet] either shortly preceded or followed the breaking off of the connection. (*Archiv*, 60: 39.)

BUTLER: [The love of Sh.'s mistress for W. H.] had been but recent, and already she was hating him. Whether the disappointment was on her side or on Mr. W. H.'s does not appear, but I suspect it to have been on the lady's [cf. 70, 8 and 94, 3].

WYNDHAM: The Second Series ends with this sonnet. . . . It is important . . . to remember that the numbers of this series rank chronologically with 33–42, and

that, like them, they are early as well as episodical, and in the main playful, with but little, by comparison to the later groups, of grave speculation and ethereal beauty. The poet's love for the Dark Lady may well have been over some three years before he took up his pen to write a "Satire to Decay" (100–125).

153

CUPID laid by his brand and fell a sleepe,
A maide of *Dyans* this aduantage found,
And his loue-kindling fire did quickly steepe
In a could vallie-fountaine of that ground:
Which borrowd from this holie fire of loue,
A datelesse liuely heat still to indure,
And grew a seething bath which yet men proue,
Against strang malladies a soueraigne cure:
But at my mistres eie loues brand new fired,
The boy for triall needes would touch my brest,
I sick withall the helpe of bath desired,
And thether hied a sad distemperd guest.
But found no cure, the bath for my help lies,
Where *Cupid* got new fire; my mistres eye.

5. **this**] *his* G, S, E.
6. **datelesse liuely**] Hyphened by Sta, Hu².
8. **strang**] *strange* 1640, G, etc.
9. **eie**] *eyes* S, E.
11. **withall**] *with all* 1640, G.
12. **thether**] *thither* G, etc.
14. **eye**] *eyes* 1640, G, etc.

MALONE: This and the following sonnet are composed of the very same thoughts differently versified. They seem to have been early essays of the poet, who perhaps had not determined which he should prefer. He hardly could have intended to send them both into the world. COLLIER: [They are to be looked upon] as if the author had first composed one, and, not quite pleasing himself, had afterwards written the other. Possibly they were not by the same hand, two different poets dealing with the same fancy.

W. HERTZBERG [(*Jahrb.*, 13: 158) points out that the original source of this pair of sonnets was apparently an epigram in the Palatine Anthology, Bk. IX, No. 637:

Τῷδ' ὑπὸ τὰς πλατάνους ἁπαλῷ τετρυμένος ὕπνῳ
εὗδεν Ἔρως, νύμφαις λαμπάδα παρθέμενος.
Νύμφαι δ' ἀλλήλῃσι, "τί μέλλομεν; αἴθε δὲ τούτῳ
σβέσσαμεν," εἶπον, "ὁμοῦ πῦρ κραδίης μερόπων."
Λαμπὰς δ' ὡς ἔφλεξε καὶ ὕδατα, θερμὸν ἐκεῖθεν
Νύμφαι Ἐρωτιάδες λουτροχοεῦσιν ὕδωρ.

The author is Marianus, a Byzantine, probably of the 5th century. Hertzberg observes that the germ of the poem appears in an epigram attributed to a certain Zenodotus, of uncertain date:

Τίς γλίψας τὸν Ἔρωτα παρὰ κρήνῃσιν ἔθηκεν;
Οἰόμενος παύσειν τοῦτο τὸ πῦρ ὕδατι.

The Palatine collection was first published 1815–17; but an abridgment, made by Maximus Planudes about 1350, was widely circulated in western Europe; and of Latin translations there were also a number, — *Selecta epigrammata*, Basel, 1529, and some eight others before the end of the century. One or another of these would surely have found its way to England. — Hertzberg believed himself to be the original discoverer of this Greek source of the sonnet, and has been generally credited with it accordingly. J. C. COLLINS, however, says that "it had been known long before, . . . and indeed was so notorious that Dr. Wellesley in his *Anthologia Polyglotta* (1849), p. 93, printed S. 154, without any remark, underneath the Greek original." (*Fort. Rev.*, n.s., 73: 848n.)]

The following is Mackail's translation of the Marianus epigram:

Here beneath the plane-trees, overborne by soft sleep, Love slumbered, giving his torch to the Nymphs' keeping; and the Nymphs said one to another, "Why do we delay? and would that with this we might have quenched the fire in the heart of mortals." But now, the torch having kindled even the waters, the amorous Nymphs pour hot water thence into the bathing pool. (*Epigrams from the Greek Anthology*, 1890, p. 191.)

S. VON HEGEDÜS [has recently pointed out (*Ungarische Rundschau für soziale Wissenschaften;* reported in *Jahrb.*, 50: 153) that a version of the epigram is found in the *Anthologia Latina* (Codex Salmasiani), No. 271. The following is the text (ed. Bücheler & Riese, 1: 216):]

Ante bonam Venerem gelidæ per litora Baiæ
Illa natare lacus cum lampade iussit Amorem.
Dum natat, algentes cecidit scintilla per undas;
Hinc vapor ussit aquas: quicumque natavit, amavit.

[Meantime M. J. WOLFF (*Jahrb.*, 47: 191) had noted an Italian version quoted in Tolomei's *Versi et Regole*, 1539, as follows:

Tradotto da M. Statio Romano.

De l'acque di Baia.

Al lido gia di Baia, sotto un bel Platano Amore
Dormendo stanco presso posò la face,
Naiade Calliroe, de li gioveni amanti pietosa,
Toltola, l'immerse nel vago freddo rio.

Ilqual, mentre dee smorzarla, accesi et arse,
Quinci le belle acque sempre coccenti sono.

And P. TAUSIG (*Jahrb.*, 40: 231) cites an analogue in a German poem purporting to explain the origin of the baths of Vienna. SARRAZIN (*Jahrb.*, 31: 229), ready, as always, to see evidence of a continental journey of Sh.'s, suggests that he may have seen the Latin version of the epigram used as a motto at one of the popular Italian spas.]

LEE: An added detail Sh. borrowed from a very recent adaptation of the epigram in Giles Fletcher's *Licia*, 1593 (S. 27), where the poet's Love bathes in the fountain, with the result not only that "she touched the water and it burnt with love," but also

Now by her means it purchas'd hath that bliss
Which all diseases quickly can remove.

(*Life*, p. 113.)

6. **datelesse.** Cf. 30, 6.

8. **strang.** TYLER: [This] might possibly represent "strong."

11. **bath.** STEEVENS: Query, whether we should read Bath (i.e., the city of that name). The following words seem to authorise it. MALONE: The old copy is certainly right. [Cf. line 7 and 154, 11.] PLUMPTRE [(*Contemp. Rev.*, 55:584) argues for the view that Sh. actually wrote the sonnet at Bath, and notes a tradition that Diana was a kind of tutelary deity of the place.] BEECHING: There is undoubtedly a reference to the Bath waters, for the Greek original says nothing about curative powers. [H. PEMBERTON (*New Shakespeareana*, 8: 64) develops the same view (following an argument of Greenwood's in *The Sh. Problem Restated*, p. 127); the term "valley fountain" is thought to be especially appropriate; and Queen Elizabeth may be the "maid of Dian's" and "the fairest votary." Sh. may, then, have written the sonnets for Lord Hunsdon, who went to Bath for the waters in 1602, where the Queen was also expected.]

DOWDEN: Shenstone versifies anew the theme of this and the following sonnet in his "Anacreontic":

['T was in a cool Aonian glade,
The wanton Cupid, spent with toil,
Had sought refreshment from the shade,
And stretch'd him on the mossy soil.

A vagrant Muse drew nigh, and found
The subtle traitor fast asleep;
And is it thine to snore profound,
She said, and leave the world to weep? . . .

Sleep on, poor child! whilst I withdraw,
And this thy vile artillery hide, —
When the Castalian fount she saw,
And plung'd his arrows in the tide. . . .

. . . Every dart,
Dipt in the Muses' mystic spring,
Acquir'd new force to wound the heart,
And taught at once to love and sing.]

154

THE little Loue-God lying once a sleepe,
Laid by his side his heart inflaming brand,
Whilst many Nymphes that vou'd chast life to keep,
Came tripping by, but in her maiden hand,
The fayrest votary tooke vp that fire,
Which many Legions of true hearts had warm'd,
And so the Generall of hot desire,
Was sleeping by a Virgin hand disarm'd.
This brand she quenched in a coole Well by,
Which from loues fire tooke heat perpetuall,
Growing a bath and healthfull remedy,
For men diseasd, but I my Mistrisse thrall,
Came there for cure and this by that I proue,
Loues fire heates water, water cooles not loue.

2. **heart inflaming**] *heart in flaming* 1640, G, S, E; hyphened by C, M, etc.

ISAAC [discusses the writing of two sonnets on the same theme as a convention for which parallels are to be found in Petrarch, Michelangelo, Surrey, Sidney, etc. (*Archiv*, 60: 34.)]

7. **Generall.** TYLER: Chief cause and promoter.

9. **Well.** [One of the three words in Q whose capitalization WYNDHAM cannot explain. (p. 264.)]

13. **this.** DOWDEN: This statement which follows.

H. W. BARRETT: We know not how a more touching conclusion [to the Sonnets] could have been conceived, than this beautiful allegory. Its very repetition is one of the finest strokes of poetical art. It is scarcely inferior to that most affecting scene, in which Ophelia appears — deliriously singing fragments of wild songs, and dancing so recklessly and unfeelingly over the hot embers of her misery. . . . Those who read the preceding sonnets most worthily, will be most fully prepared to appreciate the fine allegory of *tears*. (*American Rev.*, 6: 309.) [An instructive example of the lengths to which divinatory criticism, with the unity of the sonnet collection as a basic assumption, can go. — ED.]

ISAAC [has a suspicion, which we may be grateful to him for stating tentatively, with a "wäre es zum Beispiel," that this pair of sonnets may be interpreted symbolically, the healing spring standing for marriage. In that case they may have been written after a journey home to Stratford. (*Archiv*, 60: 36.) DOWDEN observes (rev. ed.) that this hardly agrees with 154, 12–13. Miss PORTER suspects an esoterically "playful adaptation of this Cupid fable to the Sonnets," S. 153 referring especially to the "first Series," S. 154 to the second. In that case the closing line sums up both:] Love's fire heats genially the cold valley fountain of platonic love, but no such water is cold enough to cure the fever-heat of sexual love.

APPENDIX

GENERAL CRITICISM

(Selected with special reference to the question of the personal elements in the Sonnets, and to their poetic form and qualities)

CHARLES GILDON: I am confident, that tho' the Poems this Volume contains are extreamly distinguish'd in their Excellence, and Value, yet there is not one of them, that does not carry its Author's Mark, and Stamp upon it. Not only the same Manner of Thinking, the same Turn of Thought, but even the same Mode of Dress and Expression, the Decompounds, his peculiar sort of Epithets, which distinguishes his from the Verses of all his Contempories or Successors. . . . Whoever knows any thing of Shakespear will find his Genius in every Epigram of these Poems in every particular I have mention'd, and the frequent *Catachreses;* his Starts aside in Allegories, and in short his Versification, which is very unequal; sometimes flowing smoothly but gravely like the Thames, at other times down right Prose. He never touches on an Image in any of them, but he proves the Poem genuine.

But some, perhaps, who are for undervaluing what they have no Share in may say, that granting them to be Shakespears, yet they are not valuable enough to be reprinted, as was plain by the first Editors of his Works who wou'd otherwise have join'd them altogether.*

To this I answer — That the Assertion is false, or were it not it is more, than the Objector knows by his own Judgment, and Understanding, but to prove it false we need only consider, that they are much less imperfect in their Kind, than ev'n the best of his Plays, as will appear from the Rules I shall lay down immediately; in the next Place the first Editors were Players, who had nothing to do with any thing but the Dramatic Part, which yet they publish'd full of gross Mistakes, most of which remain to this Day; nor were they by any means Judges of the Goodness or Badness of, the Beauties or Defects of either Plays or Poems.

There is next an Objection, that if these Poems had been Genuine, they had been publish'd in the Life time of the Author and by himself, but coming out almost thirty Years after his Death there is great Reason to suspect that they are not Genuine.

To this I answer, that if nothing was to be thought his but what was publish'd in his Life time, much the greater Number of his Plays wou'd be as lyable to this Objection as his Poems. Next there is indeed, no weight in the Objection, is there any thing more common, than the Publication of Works of great Men after their Death. . . . No, no, there is a Likeness in one Man's Children generally, which extends not beyond the Family, and in the Children of the Brain it is always so, when they are begot by a Genius indeed. Besides these Poems being most to his Mistress it is not at all unlikely, that she kept

* [All this, of course, is directed against Rowe and his edition of the *Works*. — ED.]

them by her till they fell into her Executors Hands or some Friend, who would not let them be any longer conceal'd. But after all there were more in Proportion of these Poems of this Volume, printed in his Lifetime, than of his Plays, as is plain from his *Venus* and *Adonis*, his *Tarquin* and *Lucrece*, and several *Epigrams* and *Sonnets*. . . .

Tho' Love and its Effects are often happily enough touch'd in many of these Poems, yet I must confess that it is but too visible, that Petrarch had a little infected his way of thinking on that Subject, yet who ever can admire Mr. Cowley's Mistress, has a thousand Times more Cause of Admiration of our Shakespear in his Love Verses, because he has sometimes such touches of Nature as will make Amends for those Points, those *Epigrammatic Acumina*, which are not or ever can be the Product of a Soul truly touch'd with the Passion of Love. . . .

All that I have to say of the Miscellaneous Poems is, that they are generally Epigrams, and those perfect in their kind according to the best Rules that have been drawn from the Practice of the *Ancients*, by Scaliger, Lillius Giraldus, Minturnus, Robertellus, Correas, Possovinus, Pontatrus Raderus, Donatus, Vossius and Vavasser the Jesuit, at least as far as they agree. . . . Vavassor defines [the Epigram] in his Treatise on this Subject, thus. *An epigram is a short Copy of Verses, with Beauty and Point treating of one only thing, and concluding with a more beautiful Point.* . . . So that its Parts (says Vavassor) are but two the expressing or reciting the Subject, and the Conclusion; and its Beauties are Brevity, and *Acumen* which I term *Point*. . . .

The Way to attain Brevity is not to aim at many Things in the whole Epigram, then to express even that little as concisely as possible, and in such Words, that to extend it into more wou'd enervate, and lose the Force and Strength of the Thought, and the Point or Acumen.

The next Quality is Beauty, that is an exact and harmonious Formation of the whole, and the apt Agreement of all the Parts of the Poem from the Beginning to the End, with a certain sort of Sweetness, as of a natural Colour without any Fucus on the one Hand, and yet without any thing low and mean on the other; and tho' it be plain and rude Nature, yet not a meer rustic Simplicity void of all Art, but that which is agreeable to a Court Conversation; and the Language of the Polite. The Beauty of the Epigram must always be accompany'd with Sweetness. And this varies according to the Subject. If that be delicate, soft, tender, amorous, &c. those Qualities will arise from the well expressing the Nature of the Subject that will give *Beauty* and *Sweetness*. In the Language we ought rather to avoid that, which is harsh, or an enemy to Sweetness, than to study too much to find out that which may help and increase it. The *Point* is what the Epigrammatical Critics stand much upon, which is chiefly in the Conclusion by ending with something unexpected, or biting.

All things are the allow'd Subject of the Epigram; as long as they are treated of with Brevity, Point, and Beauty.*

* [That Gildon includes the Sonnets under the term "epigram" may be explained by two circumstances: the fact that he is reprinting them from the edition of 1640, in which the term

How far Shakespear has excell'd in this Way is plain from his Poems before us; but this must be allow'd him, that much of the Beauty and Sweetness of Expression, which is so much contended for is lost by the Injury of Time and the great Change of our Language since his Time; and yet there is a wonderful Smoothness in many of them, that makes the Blood dance to its Numbers.

("Remarks on the Poems of Shakespear," in *The Works of W. Sh., Volume the Seventh*, 1710, pp. 445–50, 457–63.)

GEORGE STEEVENS: Of the sonnets before us, 126 are inscribed (as Mr. Malone observes) to a friend: the remaining 28 (a small proportion out of so many) are devoted to a mistress. Yet if our author's Ferdinand and Romeo had not expressed themselves in terms more familiar to human understanding, I believe few readers would have rejoiced in the happiness of the one, or sympathized with the sorrows of the other. Perhaps, indeed, quaintness, obscurity, and tautology are to be regarded as the constituent parts of this exotic species of composition.

EDMUND MALONE: I do not feel any great propensity to stand forth as the champion of these compositions. However, as it appears to me that they have been somewhat underrated, I think it incumbent on me to do them that justice to which they seem entitled. . . . When they are described as a mass of affectation, pedantry, circumlocution, and nonsense, the picture appears to me overcharged. Their great defects seem to be a want of variety and the majority of them not being directed to a female, to whom alone such ardent expressions of esteem could with propriety be addressed. It cannot be denied too that they contain some far-fetched conceits; but are our author's plays entirely free from them? Many of the thoughts that occur in his dramatic productions are found here likewise, as may appear from the numerous parallels that have been cited from his dramas, chiefly for the purpose of authenticating these poems. Had they therefore no other merit, they are entitled to our attention, as often illustrating obscure passages in his plays. I do not perceive that the versification of these pieces is less smooth and harmonious than that of Sh.'s other compositions. Though many of them are not so simple and clear as they ought to be, yet some of them are written with perspicuity and energy.

STEEVENS: The case of these sonnets is certainly bad, when so little can be advanced in support of them. . . . I must add that there is more conceit in any thirty-six of Sh.'s Sonnets than in the same number of his plays.

BOSWELL: I cannot but admit that Mr. Malone, in his answers to Mr. Steevens, — though I think, to use Dr. Johnson's expression, they are conclusive *ad hominem*, — has done but scanty justice to these beautiful compositions.*

(*Plays and Poems of Sh.*, Malone-Boswell ed., 20: 358–63.)

"sonnets" did not occur, and the fact that he bases his remarks on the critics who were concerned with classical poetry and for whom, therefore, the sonnet had no recognized existence. In this connection it may be noted (as Professor W. D. Briggs brings to my attention) that Jonson's 56th Epigram, "On Poet-Ape," is in the Shakespearean sonnet form. — ED.]

* [It should be noted that the greater portion of this controversy, not represented by these extracts, concerned the merit of the sonnet as a form of poetry rather than that of the Sonnets

William Wordsworth: Among us it is a current, I might say an established opinion, that Sh. is justly praised when he is pronounced to be "a wild irregular genius, in whom great faults are compensated by great beauties." How long may it be before this misconception passes away, and it becomes universally acknowledged that the judgment of Sh. in the selection of his materials, and in the manner in which he has made them, heterogeneous as they often are, constitute a unity of their own, and contribute all to one great end, is not less admirable than his imagination, his invention, and his intuitive knowledge of human nature!

There is extant a small volume of miscellaneous poems, in which Sh. expresses his own feelings in his own person. It is not difficult to conceive that the editor, George Steevens, should have been insensible to the beauties of one portion of that volume, the Sonnets; though in no part of the writings of this poet is found, in an equal compass, a greater number of exquisite feelings felicitously expressed. But, from regard to the critic's own credit, he would not have ventured to talk of an act of parliament not being strong enough to compel the perusal of those little pieces,* if he had not known that the people of England were ignorant of the treasures contained in them.

(Essay supplementary to the Preface to the *Lyrical Ballads*, 1815.)

Nathan Drake: We altogether deny that either affectation or pedantry can, in the proper sense of the terms, be applied to the Sonnets of Sh. Were any modern, indeed, of the nineteenth century to adopt their language and style, he might justly be taxed with both; but in Sidney and Sh. it was habit, indissoluble habit, and not affectation; it was the diction in which they had been practised from early youth to clothe their sentiments and feelings; it was identified with all their associations and intellectual operations; it was the language, in fact, the mode of expression, in a greater or less degree, of all their contemporaries; and to have stripped their thoughts of a dress which to us appears quaint and artificial would have been to them a painful and more elaborate task. When once, indeed, we can attribute this artificial, though often emphatic style, as we ought to do, to the universally defective taste of the age in which it sprang, and not to individual usage, we shall be prepared to do justice to injured genius, and to confess, that frequently beneath this laboured phraseology are to be found sentiments simple, natural, and touching. We may also very safely affirm of Sh.'s Sonnets that, if their style be compared with that of his predecessors and contemporaries, in the same department of poetry, a manifest superiority must often be awarded him, on the score of force, dignity, and simplicity of expression; qualities of which we shall very soon afford the reader some striking instances.

of Sh. Steevens's last word, and most notorious, appeared in the Advertisement to his 1793 edition of Sh., where he defended his omission of the Sonnets and observed that "the strongest Act of Parliament that could be framed would fail to compel readers into their service." — Ed.]

* This flippant insensibility was publicly reprehended by Mr. Coleridge in a course of Lectures upon Poetry given by him at the Royal Institution. For the various merits of thought and language in Sh.'s Sonnets, see Numbers 27, 29, 30, 32, 33, 54, 64, 66, 68, 73, 76, 86, 91, 92, 93, 97, 98, 105, 107, 108, 109, 111, 113, 114, 116, 117, 129, and many others.

To a certain extent, we must admit the charge of circumlocution, not as applied to individual sonnets, but to the subject on which the whole series is written. The obscurities of this species of poem have almost uniformly arisen from density and compression of style, nor are the compositions of Sh. more than usually free from this source of defect; but when it is considered that our author has written 126 sonnets for the sole purpose of expressing his attachment to his patron, it must necessarily follow that a subject so continually reiterated would display no small share of circumlocution. Great ingenuity has been exhibited by the poet in varying his phraseology and ideas; but no effort could possibly obviate the monotony, as the result of such a task.

We shall not condescend to a refutation of [Steevens's] fourth epithet, which, if at all applicable to any portion of Sh.'s minor poems, can alone apply to Sonnets 135 and 136, which are a continued pun upon his Christian name, a species of trifling which was the peculiar vice of our author's age.

That an attempt to exhaust the subject of friendship; to say all that could be collected on the topic, would almost certainly lead, in the days of Sh., to abstractions too subtile and metaphysical, and to a cast of diction sometimes too artificial and scholastic for modern taste, no person well acquainted with the progress of our literature can deny; but candour will, at the same time, admit that the expression and versification of his sonnets are often natural, spirited, and harmonious, and that where the surface has been rendered hard and repulsive by the peculiarities of the period of their production, we have only to search beneath, in order to discover a rich ore of thought, imagery, and sentiment. . . .

So far from affectation and pedantry being the general characteristic of these pieces, impartial criticism must declare that more frequent examples of simple, clear, and nervous diction are to be culled from them than can be found among the sonnets of any of his contemporaries. [Sonnet 71] is given, not as a solitary proof, but as the exemplar of a numerous class of Shakespearean sonnets; and with the remark that neither in this instance, nor in many others, is there, either in versification, language, or thought, the smallest deviation into the regions of affectation or conceit. . . . Simplicity of style and tenderness of sentiment form the sole features of this sonnet; but in [Sonnet 116,] with an equal chastity of diction, are combined more energy and dignity, together with the infusion of some noble and appropriate imagery. It must also be added that the flow and structure of the verse are singularly pleasing. . . . In spirit, however, in elegance, in the skill and texture of its modulation, and beyond all, in the dignified and highly poetical close of the third quatrain, no one of our author's sonnets excels the 29th.

(*Sh. and his Times*, 2: 75–82.)

James Boswell [the younger]: Whoever the person might be to whom the greater part of these sonnets was addressed, it seems to have been generally admitted that the poet speaks in his own person; and some of his critics have attempted, by inferences drawn from them, to eke out the scanty memorials

which have come down to us of the incidents of his life. I confess myself to be as skeptical on this point as on [Drake's theory respecting Southampton]. . . . If [the Sonnets] were composed before Meres's publication, he could not have been at a more advanced age than thirty-four; and even if we were to adopt the theory of Dr. Drake, and suppose that most of them were produced at a subsequent period, and fix upon the latest possible year, 1609, yet still the description of decrepitude which is found in the 73d Sonnet could scarcely, without violent exaggeration, be applicable to a man of forty-five. But he must not only have been old, he must also have been grossly and notoriously profligate. To say nothing of the criminal connection (for criminal in a high degree it would certainly have been in a married man) which is frequently alluded to in those Sonnets which are said to be addressed by him in his own character to a female, we find him, in a passage already quoted, speaking in terms of shame and remorse of his "harmful deeds," of something from which his "name had received a brand," and of "the impression which vulgar scandal had stamped upon his brow." I trust it will not require much argument to show that this picture could not be put for gentle Sh. We may lament that we know so little of his history; but this, at least, may be asserted with confidence, that at no time was the slightest imputation cast upon his moral character; and that, in an age abounding, as Mr. Steevens has observed, with illiberal private abuse and peevish satire, the concurring testimony of his contemporaries will confirm the declaration of honest Chettle, that "his demeanour was no less civil, than he excellent in the quality he professed." Upon the whole, I am satisfied that these compositions had neither the poet himself nor any individual in view, but were merely the effusions of his fancy, written upon various topics for the amusement of a private circle.

(*Plays and Poems of Sh.*, 1821, 20: 219–20.)

Henry Hallam: No one, as far as I remember, has ever doubted their genuineness; no one can doubt that they express not only real but intense emotions of the heart: but when they were written, who was the W. H. quaintly called their begetter, by which we can only understand the cause of their being written, and to what persons or circumstances they allude, has of late years been the subject of much curiosity. These sonnets were long overlooked: Steevens spoke of them with the utmost scorn, as productions which no one could read: but a very different suffrage is generally given by the lovers of poetry; and perhaps there is now a tendency, especially among young men of poetical tempers, to exaggerate the beauties of these remarkable productions. They rise, indeed, in estimation, as we attentively read and reflect upon them; for I do not think that at first they give us much pleasure. No one ever entered more fully than Sh. into the character of this species of poetry, which admits of no expletive imagery, no merely ornamental line. But, though each sonnet has generally its proper unity, the sense (I do not mean the grammatical construction) will sometimes be found to spread from one to another, independently of that repetition of the leading idea, like variations of an air, which a

series of them frequently exhibits, and on account of which they have latterly been reckoned by some rather an integral poem than a collection of sonnets. But this is not uncommon among the Italians, and belongs, in fact, to those of Petrarch himself. They may easily be resolved into several series, according to their subjects: but, when read attentively, we find them relate to one definite, though obscure, period of the poet's life; in which an attachment to some female, which seems to have touched neither his heart nor his fancy very sensibly, was overpowered, without entirely ceasing, by one to a friend; and this last is of such an enthusiastic character, and so extravagant in the phrases that the author uses, as to have thrown an unaccountable mystery over the whole work. It is true that in the poetry as well as in the fictions of early ages we find a more ardent tone of affection in the language of friendship than has since been usual; and yet no instance has been adduced of such rapturous devotedness, such an idolatry of admiring love, as one of the greatest beings whom nature ever produced in the human form pours forth to some unknown youth in the majority of these sonnets. . . .

If we seize a clew which innumerable passages give us, and suppose that they allude to a youth of high rank as well as personal beauty and accomplishment, in whose favor and intimacy, according to the base prejudices of the world, a player and a poet, though he were the author of *Macbeth*, might be thought honored, something of the strangeness, as it appears to us, of Sh.'s humiliation in addressing him as a being before whose feet he crouched, whose frown he feared, whose injuries, and those of the most insulting kind — the seduction of the mistress to whom we have alluded — he felt and bewailed without resenting; something, I say, of the strangeness of this humiliation, and at best it is but little, may be lightened, and in a certain sense rendered intelligible. [I.e., by the Pembroke theory.] . . .

Notwithstanding the frequent beauties of these sonnets, the pleasure of their perusal is greatly diminished by these circumstances; and it is impossible not to wish that Sh. had never written them. There is a weakness and folly in all excessive and misplaced affection, which is not redeemed by the touches of nobler sentiments that abound in this long series of sonnets. But there are also faults of a merely critical nature. The obscurity is often such as only conjecture can penetrate; the strain of tenderness and adoration would be too monotonous, were it less unpleasing; and so many frigid conceits are scattered around, that we might almost fancy the poet to have written without genuine emotion, did not such a host of other passages attest the contrary.

(*Introduction to the Literature of Europe*, Part III, chap. 5, §§ 48–50.)

Charles Knight: The publication of *The Passionate Pilgrim* was unquestionably unauthorized and piratical. The publisher got all he could which existed in manuscript; and he took two poems out of *L. L. L.*, which was printed only the year before. In 1609 we have no hesitation in believing that the same process was repeated; that without the consent of the writer the 154 Sonnets — some forming a continuous poem, or poems; others isolated, in the

subjects to which they relate and the persons to whom they were addressed — were collected together without any key to their arrangement, and given to the public. . . . Where is the difficulty of imagining, with regard to poems of which each separate poem, sonnet, or stanza, is either a "leading idea," or its "variation," that, picked up as we think they were from many quarters, the supposed connection must be in many respects fanciful, in some a result of chance, mixing what the poet wrote in his own person, either in moments of elation or depression, with other apparently continuous stanzas that painted an imaginary character, indulging in all the warmth of an exaggerated friendship, in the complaints of an abused confidence, in the pictures of an unhallowed and unhappy love; sometimes speaking with the real earnestness of true friendship and a modest estimation of his own merits; sometimes employing the language of an extravagant eulogy, and a more extravagant estimation of the powers of the man who was writing that eulogy? Suppose, for example, that in the leisure hours, we will say, of William Herbert Earl of Pembroke, and William Sh., the poet should have undertaken to address to the youth an argument why he should marry. Without believing the Earl to be the W. H. of the Dedication, we know that he was a friend of Sh. There is nothing in the first 17 Sonnets which might not have been written in the artificial tone of the Italian poetry, in the working out of this scheme. Suppose, again, that in other Sonnets the poet, in the same artificial spirit, complains that the friend has robbed him of his mistress, and avows that he forgives the falsehood. There is nothing in all this which might not have been written essentially as a work of fiction, — received as a work of fiction, — handed about amongst "private friends" without the slightest apprehension that it would be regarded as an exposition of the private relations of two persons separated in rank as they probably were in their habitual intimacies, — of very different ages, — the one an avowedly profligate boy, the other a matured man. But this supposition does not exclude the idea that the poet had also, at various times, composed, in the same measure, other poems, truly expressing his personal feelings, — with nothing inflated in their tone, perfectly simple and natural, offering praise, expressing love to his actual friends (in the language of the time "lovers"), showing regret in separation, dreading unkindness, hopeful of continued affection. These are also circulated amongst "private friends." Some "W. H." collects them together, ten, twelve, or fifteen years after they have been written; and a publisher, of course, is found to give to the world any productions of a man so eminent as Sh. . . . In the same volume with these Sonnets was published a most exquisite narrative poem, *A Lover's Complaint*. The form of it entirely prevents any attempt to consider it autobiographical. The Sonnets, on the contrary, are personal in their form; but it is not therefore to be assumed that they are *all* personal in their relation to the author.

("Illustration of the Sonnets," *Pictorial Sh.*, vol. 6.)

George G. Gervinus: What a living picture would our poet have left behind if, when prompted by his love, he had sung the union of soul with his

sweet youth in the free forms suggested by the moment and by the nature of the circumstances! But as he moulded all into this one angular form, which admits of no distinctness and which spreads a dim mist over each tangible meaning, we can readily understand how it was that for so long a time the bare actual circumstances could be misunderstood or overlooked. This one drawback is followed by another, arising equally naturally from the style. The want of reality in these indistinct poems was to be supplied by poetic brilliancy; the relation between the means and the object, between cause and effect, disappears; far-fetched thoughts, strange exaggerated images, and hyperbolic phrases, mislead the understanding; profound conceits and epigrammatic fancies, sparkling for their own sake, cast the subject in question on this very account into the shade. This intensely poetic language does not prevent even the repetition of matter and expression in the same monotonous form, so that the tautology is constant. And as in *Lucrece* the poet involuntarily experienced surprise at the peculiarities of that conceit-style of the Marinists, here also in the midst of his work he acknowledges (S. 76) that his verse is "barren of new pride, so far from variation or quick change," that he writes "all one, ever the same," and keeps his "invention in a noted weed." In this weed it is not easy to recognize the true and real purport; tact and comparison must teach us not to accept it all too much as simple truth, and yet also not unthinkingly to lose the certain meaning.

We are of opinion, with Cunningham and others, that the sonnets of our poet, æsthetically considered, have been overestimated. With respect to their psychological tenor, they appear to us, with the total lack of all other sources for the history of Sh.'s inner life, to be of inestimable value. They exhibit the poet to us just in the most interesting period of his mental development, when he passed from dependent to independent art, from foreign to national taste, from subserviency and distress to prosperity and happiness; aye, even from loose morality to inner reformation. And in addition to the gigantic, scarcely comprehensible picture of his mental development which is presented to us in his dramas of this period, we here receive a small intelligible painting of his inner life, which brings us more closely to the poet himself. . . . [The friendship treated of in the Sonnets] is a connection in itself of no great importance; nay, in the way in which it is poetically expressed, it is not without distortion. But it testifies to a strength of feeling and passion in our poet, to a childlike nature and a candid mind, to a simple ingenuousness, to a perfect inability to veil his thoughts or to dissemble, to an innate capacity for allowing circumstances to act upon his mind in all their force and for re-acting upon them — in a word, it testifies to a nature as truthful, genuine, and straightforward as we imagine the poet from his dramatic works to have possessed.

(*Shakespeare Commentaries*, Bunnet trans., pp. 451–52; 463.)

Henry N. Hudson: Great effort has been made to find in the Sonnets some deeper or other meaning than meets the ear, and to fix upon them, generally, a personal and autobiographical character. It must indeed be

owned that there is in several of them an earnestness of tone, and in some few a subdued pathos, which strongly argues them to be expressions of the poet's real feelings respecting himself, his condition, and the person or persons addressed. This is particularly the case with a series of ten, beginning with the 109th. Something the same may be said of the 23d, 25th, and 26th, where we find a striking resemblance to some expressions used in the dedications of the *V. & A.* and of the *Lucrece*. But, as to the greater part of the Sonnets, I have long been growing more and more convinced that they were intended mainly as exercises of fancy, cast in a form of personal address, and perhaps mingling an element of personal interest or allusion, merely as a matter of art; whatever there is of personal in them being thus kept subordinate and incidental to poetical beauty and effect. . . . It was a common fashion of the time, in sonnet writing, for authors to speak in an ideal or imaginary character as if it were their real one, and to attribute to themselves certain thoughts and feelings, merely because it suited their purpose, and was a part of their art as poets, so to do. And this, I make no doubt, is the true key to the mystery which has puzzled so many critics in the Sonnets of Sh. In writing sonnets, he naturally fell into the current style of the age; only, by how much he surpassed the others in dramatic power, by so much was he better able to express ideal sentiments as if they were his own, and to pass out of himself into the characters he had imagined or assumed. . . .

Touching the merits of the Sonnets, there need not much be said. Some of them would hardly do credit to a school-boy, while many are such as it may well be held an honor even to Sh. to have written; there being nothing of the kind in the language approaching them, except a few of Milton's and a good many of Wordsworth's. That in these the poet should have sometimes rendered his work excessively frigid with the euphuistic conceits and affectations of the time, is far less wonderful than the exquisite beauty, and often more than beauty, of sentiment and imagery that distinguishes a large portion of them. Many might be pointed out, which, with perfect clearness and compactness of thought, are resplendent with the highest glories of imagination; others are replete with the tenderest pathos; others, again, are compact of graceful fancy and airy elegance; while in all these styles there are specimens perfectly steeped in the melody of sounds and numbers, as if the thought were born of music, and the music interfused with its very substance.

(*Works of Sh.*, Harvard Edition, 20: 83–86.)

Alexander Dyce: Repeated perusals of the Sonnets have well nigh convinced me that most of them were composed in an assumed character, on different subjects, and at different times, for the amusement, if not at the suggestion, of the author's intimate associates (hence described by Meres as "his sugred Sonnets among his private friends"): and though I would not deny that one or two of them reflect his genuine feelings (e.g., S. 111), I contend that allusions scattered through the whole series are not to be hastily referred to the personal circumstances of Sh. In the general excellence of these Sonnets, —

in their depth of thought, their tenderness, their picturesqueness, their grace, their harmony, — we forget their occasional conceits and quibbles: and indeed no English sonnets are worthy, in all respects, of being ranked with Sh.'s, if we except the few by Milton.

(Life of Sh., *Works*, 3d ed., 1: 98–102.)

William Minto: The sonnets addressed to a friend . . . depart very strikingly from the sonnets of Sh.'s predecessors. He ceases to reiterate Petrarch's woes, and opens up a new vein of feeling. Love is still the argument — love's fears and confidences, crosses and triumphs — but it is love for a different object under different conditions. We find in Sh.'s sonnets most of the commonplaces of the course of true love, coldness and reconciliation, independence and devoted submission, but they are transferred to the course of impassioned friendship, and thereby transfigured. Are, then, these moods of impassioned friendship real or feigned, utterances from the heart, or artificial creations to break the monotony of the language and imagery of passionate admiration between the sexes? . . . It is bad enough to defy all indications of gender and declare that none of these sonnets were addressed to a young man: it is perhaps worse to say that some are and some are not, and to make an arbitrary selection, taking one's own feelings as the exact measure of the poet's. Admiration of the personal beauty of his friend is too closely woven into the sonnets to be detached in this way. They are interpenetrated with it: it is expressed as warmly in sonnets when the sex happens to be unequivocal, as in others where the rashness of dogmatic ingenuity is restrained by no such accident.

The friendship expressed in Sh.'s sonnets was probably no less real than the love professed for their mistresses by other sonneteers. Friendship is not quite dead even in these degenerate days. There are still people alive to whom the warmth of the warmest of Sh.'s sonnets would not appear an exaggeration. But there would seem to have been a peculiar exaltation of the sentiment of friendship among the Elizabethan poets. The titles of Edward's plays are *Damon and Pythias* and *Palamon and Arcite;* and in the one that has been preserved friendship is extolled above all other blessings. *The Paradise of Dainty Devices* is full of "praises of friendship." The dramatists did not hesitate to bring it into collision with love, and to represent it as rising in some cases higher than love itself. Marlowe makes Edward II desert his queen for the sake of Gaveston, and declares that he will rather lose his kingdom than renounce his favorite. In Lyly's *Endymion*, Eumenides affirms that "such is his unspotted faith to Endymion, that whatsoever seemeth a needle to prick his finger is a dagger to wound his heart"; and when it is in his power to obtain whatever he asks, he hesitates between the recovery of his friend Endymion and the possession of his mistress Semele, and is finally decided by an old man in favour of the friend. Sh. himself has treated the problem in his *T. G. V.* . . . All these that I have mentioned, with the exception of Edward and Gaveston, were cases of friendship between equals. Bacon laid down that friendship could not exist

between equals; and the Elizabethans were familiar with the often quoted friendships between Alexander and Hephæstion, Hercules and Hylas, Achilles and Patroclus, Socrates and Alcibiades, in which the sentiment was enhanced by the charms of strength on the one hand, and youth and beauty on the other. It is not impossible that the influence of the maiden queen had something to do with the laudation of friendship in the Elizabethan age; and the representation of women's parts on the stage by boys may have fostered to an unusual degree the sentimental admiration of beautiful youths. This last influence could hardly but have affected Sh., seeing that he acted up to boys in that character, and that they must occasionally have crossed his mind with their "small pipes" and "smooth and rubious" lips when he was composing praises of the beauty that they represented. And it is difficult to see what can have been meant by the expression *Socratem ingenio* — a Socrates in disposition — in Sh.'s epitaph, if it does not point to his sentiment for beautiful young men.

(*Characteristics of English Poets*, pp. 213–16.)

Frederick J. Furnivall: Were it not for the fact that many critics really deserving the name of Sh. students, and not Sh. fools, have held the Sonnets to be merely dramatic, I could not have conceived that poems so intensely and evidently autobiographic and self-revealing, poems so one with the spirit and inner meaning of Sh.'s growth and life, could ever have been conceived to be other than what they are, the records of his own loves and fears. And I believe that if the acceptance of them as such had not involved the consequence of Sh.'s intrigue with a married woman, all readers would have taken the Sonnets as speaking of Sh.'s own life. But his admirers are so anxious to remove every stain from him, that they contend for a non-natural interpretation of his poems. They forget the difference in opinion between Elizabethan and Victorian times as to those sweet sins of the flesh, where what is said to be stolen is so willingly given. They forget the cuckoo cry rising from nearly all Elizabethan literature, and that the intimacy now thought criminal was then in certain circles nearly as common as handshaking is with us. They forget Sh.'s impulsive nature, and his long absence from his home. They will not face the probabilities of the case, or recollect that David was still God's friend though Bathsheba lived. The Sonnets are, in one sense, Sh.'s Psalms. Spiritual struggles underlie both poets' work. For myself, I'd accept any number of "slips in sensual mire" on Sh.'s part, to have the "bursts of (loving) heart" given us in the Sonnets.

The true motto for the first group of Sh.'s Sonnets is to be seen in David's words, "I am distrest for thee, my brother Jonathan; very pleasant hast thou been unto me. Thy love to me was wonderful, passing the love of woman." We have had them reproduced for us Victorians, without their stain of sin and shame, in Mr. Tennyson's *In Memoriam*. We have had them again to some extent in Mrs. Browning's glorious sonnets to her husband, with their iterance, "Say over again, and yet once over again, that thou dost love me." We may look upon the Sonnets as a piece of music, or as Sh.'s Pathetic Sonata, each

melody introduced, dropped again, brought in again with variations, but one full strain of undying love and friendship through the whole. Why could Sh. say so beautifully for Antonio of *The Merchant*, "All debts are cleared between you and I, if I might but see you at my death: notwithstanding, use your pleasure"? Why did he make Viola declare —

> And I most jocund, apt, and willingly,
> To do you rest, a thousand deaths would die?

Why did he paint Helena alone, saying —

> 'T was pretty though a plague
> To see him every hour; to sit and draw
> His arched brows, his hawking eyes, his curls,
> In our heart's table, — heart too capable
> Of every line and trick of his sweet favour!
> But now he's gone, and my idolatrous fancy
> Must sanctify his relics.

Because he himself was Helena, Antonio. A witchcraft drew him to a "boy," a youth to whom he gave his

> Love without pretension or restraint,
> All his in dedication.

Sh. towards him was as Viola towards the Duke. He went

> After him I love more than I love these eyes,
> More than my life.

In the Sonnets we have the gentle Will, the melancholy mild-eyed man, of the Droeshout portrait. Sh.'s tender, sensitive, refined nature is seen clearly here, but through a glass darkly in the plays. . . .

Whatever their date, I wish to say with all the emphasis I can, that in my belief no one can understand Sh. who does not hold that his Sonnets are autobiographical, and that they explain the depths of the soul of the Sh. who wrote the plays. I know that Mr. Browning is against this view, and holds that if Sh. *did* "unlock his heart in his Sonnets," then "the less Sh. he." But I'd rather take, on this question, the witness of the greatest poetess of our Victorian — nay of all time yet, and ask whether she was the less, or the greater and truer, Elizabeth Barrett Browning, or poet, because she unlocked *her* heart in *her* sonnets, or because she "went forward and confessed to her critics that her poems had her *heart and life* in them, they were not empty shells!"

(Introduction to the *Leopold Shakspere*, § 11.)

Algernon C. Swinburne: A name so illustrious has recently been added to the list of theirs who dispute or deny the supposition that even in his sonnets the most inscrutably impersonal of poets did actually "unlock his heart," that it might seem negligent if not insolent to take no account of such antagonism to the opinion which to me seems so clearly just and right. Mr. Browning, per-

haps in all points the furthest removed from Wordsworth of all poets in this century, cites with something of a sneer the well-known expression of Wordsworth which gives us his opinion to that effect; and, as if scornfully rejecting a supposed suggestion that he also should do likewise, retorts in a tone of assured defiance —

Did Shakespeare? If so, the less Shakespeare he!

No, I must venture to reply; no whit the less like Shakespeare, but undoubtedly the less like Browning. . . . Even in default of his personal and articulate evidence to that effect, we should have guessed that Mr. Browning was in no wise wont to unlock his heart with any metrical key to any direct purpose — except, as it might be, "for once," when exchanging, with such happy effect, a "bronze" for a "silver" instrument. But Shakespeare, not being simply "a great dramatic poet" like Browning or like Landor, but a great dramatist in the most absolute and differential sense of the phrase, might (it seems to me) be the likelier and the more desirous, under certain circumstances which for us must be all uncertain, to relieve and disburden his mind — to unload his heart rather than to unlock it — in short personal poems of a kind as alien from the special genius or spiritual instinct of Mr. Browning as is the utterly impersonal gift of impersonation, not in one form at a time but in many forms at once, by dint of more than dramatic renunciation or annihilation of himself, which makes him the greatest of all dramatists as surely as he is not the greatest of all dramatic poets.*

("Short Notes on English Poets"; *Miscellanies*, pp. 12–13.)

Edward Dowden: The student of Sh. is drawn to the Sonnets not alone by their ardour and depth of feeling, their fertility and condensation of thought, their exquisite felicities of phrase, and their frequent beauty of rhythmical movement, but in a peculiar degree by the possibility that here, if nowhere else, the greatest of English poets may — as Wordsworth puts it — have "unlocked his heart." † It were strange if his silence, deep as that of the secrets

* [In his *Study of Sh.* Swinburne avoids the discussion of the Sonnets, with the explanation that upon them "such a preposterous pyramid of presumptuous commentary has long since been reared by the Cimmerian speculation and Bœotian 'brain-sweat' of sciolists and scholiasts, that no modest man will hope and no wise man will desire to add to the structure or subtract from it one single brick of proof or disproof, theorem or theory." — Ed.]

† Poets differ in the interpretation of the Sonnets as widely as critics.

'With this same key
Shakespeare unlocked his heart' once more!
Did Shakespeare? If so, the less Shakespeare he!

So, Mr. Browning; to whom replies Mr. Swinburne, "No whit the less like Shakespeare, but undoubtedly the less like Browning." Some of Shelley's feeling with reference to the Sonnets may be guessed from certain lines to be found among the "Studies for Epipsychidion and Cancelled Passages" (Poetical Works, ed. Forman, 2: 392–93), to which my attention has been called by Mr. E. W. Gosse:

If any should be curious to discover
Whether to you I am a friend or lover,
Let them read Shakespeare's Sonnets, taking thence
A whetstone for their dull intelligence
That tears and will not cut, or let them guess
How Diotima, the wise prophetess,

of Nature, never once knew interruption. The moment, however, we regard the Sonnets as autobiographical, we find ourselves in the presence of doubts and difficulties, exaggerated, it is true, by many writers, yet certainly real.

If we must escape from them, the simplest mode is to assume that the Sonnets are "the free outcome of a poetic imagination" (Delius). It is an ingenious suggestion of Delius that certain groups may be offsets from other poetical works of Sh. Those urging a beautiful youth to perpetuate his beauty in offspring may be a derivative from *V. & A.*; those declaring love for a dark-complexioned woman may rehandle the theme set forth in Berowne's passion for the dark Rosaline of *L. L. L.*; those which tell of a mistress resigned to a friend may be a non-dramatic treatment of the theme of love and friendship presented in the later scenes of the *T. G. V.* Perhaps a few sonnets, as 110–111, refer to circumstances of Sh.'s life (Dyce). The main body of these poems may still be regarded as mere exercises of the fancy.

Such an explanation of the Sonnets has the merit of simplicity; it unties no knots but cuts all at a blow. If the collection consists of disconnected exercises of the fancy, we need not try to reconcile discrepancies, nor shape a story, not ascertain a chronology, nor identify persons. And what indeed was a sonneteer's passion but a painted fire? What was the form of verse but an exotic curiously trained and tended, in which an artificial sentiment imported from Italy gave perfume and colour to the flower?

And yet, in this as in other forms, the poetry of the time, which possesses an enduring vitality, was not commonly caught out of the air, but — however large the conventional element in it may have been — was born of the union of heart and imagination: in it real feelings and real experience, submitting to the poetical fashions of the day, were raised to an ideal expression. Spenser wooed and wedded the Elizabeth of his *Amoretti*. The *Astrophel & Stella* tells of a veritable tragedy, fatal perhaps to two bright lives and passionate hearts. And what poems of Drummond do we remember as we remember those which record how he loved and lamented Mary Cunningham?

. . . That [Sh.] should have given admiration and love without measure to a youth high born, brilliant, accomplished, who singled out the player for peculiar favour, will seem wonderful only to those who keep a constant guard upon their affections, and to those who have no need to keep a guard at all. In the Renascence epoch, among natural products of a time when life ran swift and free, touching with its current high and difficult places, the ardent friendship of man with man was one. To elevate it above mere personal regard a kind of Neo-Platonism was at hand, which represented Beauty and Love incarnated in a human creature as earthly vicegerents of the Divinity. "It was then not uncommon," observes the sober Dyce, "for one man to write verses to another in a strain of such tender affection as fully warrants us in terming them ama-

> Instructed the instructor, and why he
> Rebuked the infant spirit of melody
> On Agathon's sweet lips, which as he spoke
> Was as the lovely star when morn has broke
> The roof of darkness, in the golden dawn,
> Half-hidden and yet beautiful.

tory." Montaigne, not prone to take up extreme positions, writes of his dead Estienne de la Boëtie with passionate tenderness which will not hear of moderation. The haughtiest spirit of Italy, Michael Angelo, does homage to the worth and beauty of young Tommaso Cavalieri in such words as these:

> Heavenward your spirit stirreth me to strain;
> E'en as you will I blush and blanch again,
> Freeze in the sun, burn 'neath a frosty sky,
> Your will includes and is the lord of mine.

The learned Languet writes to young Philip Sidney: "Your portrait I kept with me some hours to feast my eyes on it, but my appetite was rather increased than diminished by the sight." And Sidney to his guardian friend: "The chief object of my life, next to the everlasting blessedness of heaven, will always be the enjoyment of true friendship, and there you shall have the chiefest place." . . . In Allot's *Wit's Commonwealth* (1598) we read: "The love of men to women is a thing common and of course, but the friendship of man to man infinite and immortal." (I find this quotation in Elze's *William Shakespeare*, p. 497.) "Some," said Jeremy Taylor, "live under the line, and the beams of friendship in that position are imminent and perpendicular. Some have only a dark day and a long night from him [the Sun], snows and white cattle, a miserable life and a perpetual harvest of Catarrhes and Consumptions, apoplexies and dead palsies: but some have splendid fires and aromatic spices, rich wines and well-digested fruits, great wit and great courage, because they dwell in his eye and look in his face and are the Courtiers of the Sun, and wait upon him in his chambers of the East. Just so it is in friendship." Was Sh. less a courtier of the sun than Languet or Michael Angelo? . . .

Sh. of the Sonnets is not the Sh. serenely victorious, infinitely charitable, wise with all wisdom of the intellect and the heart, whom we know through the *Tempest* and *Henry VIII.* He is the Sh. of *V. & A.* and *R. & J.*, on his way to acquire some of the dark experience of *M. for M.*, and the bitter learning of *T. & C.* Sh.'s writings assure us that in the main his eye was fixed on the true ends of life, but they do not lead us to believe that he was inaccessible to temptations of the senses, the heart, and the imagination. We can only guess the frailty that accompanied such strength, the risks that attended such high powers; immense demands on life, vast ardours, and then the void hour, the deep dejection. There appears to have been a time in his life when the springs of faith and hope had almost ceased to flow; and he recovered these, not by flying from reality and life, but by driving his shafts deeper towards the centre of things. So Ulysses was transformed into Prospero, worldly wisdom into spiritual insight. Such ideal purity as Milton's was not possessed nor sought by Sh. Among these Sonnets, one or two might be spoken by Mercutio, when his wit of cheveril was stretched to an ell broad. To compensate — Sh. knew men and women a good deal better than did Milton, and probably no patches in his life are quite as unprofitably ugly as some which disfigured the life of the great idealist. His daughter could love and honour

Sh.'s memory. Lamentable it is, if he was taken in the toils, but at least we know that he escaped all toils before the end. May we dare to conjecture that Cleopatra, queen and courtesan, black from "Phœbus' amorous pinches," a "lass unparalleled," has some kinship through the imagination with the dark lady of the virginal? "Would I had never seen her," sighs out Antony; and the shrewd onlooker Enobarbus replies, "O sir, you had then left unseen a wonderful piece of work, which not to have been blest withal would have discredited your travel." . . .

If Sh. "unlocked his heart" in these Sonnets, what do we learn from them of that great heart? I cannot answer otherwise than in words of my own formerly written. "In the Sonnets we recognize three things: that Sh. was capable of measureless personal devotion; that he was tenderly sensitive, sensitive above all to every diminution or alteration of that love his heart so eagerly craved; and that, when wronged, although he suffered anguish, he transcended his private injury, and learned to forgive. . . . The errors of his heart originated in his sensitiveness, in his imagination (not at first inured to the hardness of fidelity to the fact), in his quick consciousness of existence, and in the self-abandoning devotion of his heart."

(*Sonnets of Sh.*, Introduction, pp. 4–12; 34.)

J. O. Halliwell-Phillipps: The words of Meres, and the insignificant result of Jaggard's efforts, when viewed in connection with the nature of these strange poems, lead to the inference that some of them were written in clusters, and others as separate exercises, either being contributions made by their writer to the albums of his friends, probably no two of the latter being favoured with identical compositions. There was no tradition adverse to a belief in their fragmentary character in the generation immediately following the author's death, as may be gathered from the arrangement found in Benson's edition of 1640; and this concludes the little real evidence on the subject that has descended to us. It was reserved for the students of the present century, who have ascertained so much respecting Sh. that was unsuspected by his own friends and contemporaries, to discover that his innermost earnest thoughts, his mental conflicts, and so on, are revealed in what would then be the most powerful lyrics yet given to the world. But the victim of spiritual emotions that involve criminatory reflections does not usually protrude them voluntarily on the consideration of society; and, if the personal theory be accepted, we must concede the possibility of our national dramatist gratuitously confessing his sins and revealing those of others, proclaiming his disgrace and avowing his repentance, in poetical circulars distributed by the delinquent himself amongst his most intimate friends.

There are no external testimonies of any description in favour of a personal application of the Sonnets, while there are abundant difficulties arising from the reception of such a theory. . . . It will be observed that all the hypotheses which aim at a complete biographical exposition of the Sonnets necessitate the acceptance of interpretations that are too subtle for dispassionate rea-

soners. Even in the few instances where there is a reasonable possibility that Sh. was thinking of living individuals, as when he refers to an unknown poetical rival or quibbles on his own Christian name, scarcely any, if any, light is thrown on his personal feelings or character.

(*Outlines of the Life of Sh.*, 9th ed., 1: 173–75.)

Mark Pattison: The pre-eminent series of poems known as Sh.'s sonnets mock at criticism, and I can but echo the despair of . . . Ashcroft Noble, and say that the rank they hold is such that to ignore them is impossible, and to treat them adequately not less so. Here I have only to speak of them as to form. They only present an occasional approach to perfection of type. First: each sonnet does not stand independently, but relies upon that which goes before, or on that which follows it, to complete the impression. The sonnet is thus robbed of its individuality, and becomes a stanza in a poem. To borrow an illustration from architecture, the sonnet becomes a house in a row, instead of a palace satisfying the eye from whichever side it is viewed. Secondly: in the struggle of meaning and melody with the unmalleable metal of our language, Sh.'s sonnets show us the poet frequently succumbing. In a small number out of the whole 154 does the poet distinctly emerge as master of his instrument, and only in a very few instances does he achieve an uncontested triumph over the obstinate and unpliant material. When he does so, the result is a poem, notable, distinguished, stamped with an individuality which cannot be mistaken. It was an unfortunate choice of vehicle when Sh. selected the sonnet form. It was a form in which his superabounding force strangled itself. He is baffled by the language just in proportion to the power of his thought. Sh. required freedom, and when free, he spoke English such as no other Englishman ever had skill to utter. But the sonnet's narrow bounds demand condensation. Now the formal requirement of terse expression is a boon to watery or diffuse thinkers. The compression of fourteen lines effects the expulsion of superfluities, and lends the external support of stays to a weakly frame. Quite opposite is the effect of restricted space upon a teeming fancy and a robust intellect. In him force is concentrated to begin with. In his endeavour after still further compression of energy, he becomes laboured instead of pithy, obscure instead of nervous.

As in the drama Sh. ignored the classical unities, so he will know nothing of the established laws of the sonnet. It has been said that he "disclaimed the smaller economies." May it not be that he did not know of them? What he knew of, that he followed. As in the substance of his verse he fell in with the reigning fashion of ingenious distortions, so in the form of the sonnet he adopted the metrical arrangement of Daniel, without any suspicion that there existed a better type.* Sh.'s sonnets, like Daniel's, contain seven rhymes. Their analysis is not into an octave and a sestet, but into three verses of four lines each, closed by a couplet. And such has been the fame of the series of

* [This extraordinary suggestion is the more remarkable because Pattison had just mentioned Sidney as among Sh.'s "models." — Ed.]

Shakespearean poems, that English historians of poetry have to recognize this form, and to create a new species to cover it. . . . Milton's distinction in the history of the sonnet is that, not overawed by the great name of Sh., he emancipated this form of poem from the two vices which depraved the Elizabethan sonnet — from the vice of misplaced wit in substance, and of misplaced rhyme in form. He recognized that the sonnet belonged to the poetry of feeling, and not to the poetry of ingenuity. And he saw that the perfection of metrical construction was not reached by tacking together three four-line verses rounded by a couplet at the end.

(*The Sonnets of John Milton*, Introduction, pp. 40–46.)

A. Wilson Verity: What primarily do we look for in a poem, more especially in a poem of great scope? I suppose there are two things of essential value: perfect harmony of expression and interest of subject. The poem should bear criticism from the standpoint of the artist and of the moralist: it should be flawless in manner and of vital significance in matter. What is said — the way it is said: these are two cardinal points, and of these twin essentials the latter, to my mind, is the greater. And if we ask what should regulate the expression of a poem, the answer is simple: above all things we require of the singer a true and perfect sense of melody. . . . Now from either standpoint — from that of the artist, from that of the critic of life — whether we look to their manner or their matter — the Sonnets of Sh. are great with greatness unmistakable. It is not that we come across an exquisite piece of verbal beauty from time to time; every poem reaches a standard unattainable save by the true singer; from first to last it is the

> Adventurous song
> That with no middle flight intends to soar.

The power of the language is taxed to its utmost; it can do no more; its merit as a means of poetic expression, as an instrument for the expression of a thousand varying shades of emotion, must stand or fall by such passages as these: [40, 1–4; 116, 1–10; 71, 5–8; 102, 5–12; 107, 1–3; 86, 1–4.] In lines such as these we have the last word in felicity of expression: a noble instrument sends forth its noblest notes in the master's hands, and if we ask for more piercing, more perfect melody of words, we must look to some other tongue; English can give us nothing greater than this. And such passages are not the exception: we have picked them almost at random. Open the Sonnets where we will, we find the same unerring sense of what makes for the music that, heard once, never dies from our recollection.

(Introduction to the Sonnets, *Henry Irving Sh.*, 8: 404–05.)

Barrett Wendell: Even if the Sonnets be self-revealing, their self-revelation takes a very deliberate shape. Nothing could be much further from a spontaneous outburst than these Shaksperean stanzas, whose form is among the most highly studied in our literature. During the Elizabethan period there

were at least three well-defined varieties of sonnet: the legitimate Italian, or Petrarchan, generally imitated by Wyatt, Surrey, and Sidney; the Spenserian, in which the system of rhymes resembled that of the *Faerie Queene;* and that now before us, whose most familiar example is in the work of Sh. If not so intricately melodious as the Spenserian sonnet, nor yet so sonorously sustained as the Petrarchan, this Shaksperean sonnet is constantly fresh, varied, dignified, and above all idiomatic. Why certain metrical forms seem specially at home in certain languages, it is hard to say; but as surely as the hexameter is idiomatically classic, or the *terza rima* Italian, or the alexandrine French, so the blank verse line of Elizabethan tragedy and the melodiously fluent quatrains of the Shaksperean sonnet are idiomatically English. . . .

Whatever else the Sonnets reveal, then, they surely reveal the temperament of an artist, — a temperament, as we have seen, which is not only exquisitely sensitive to emotional impressions, but is found to find the best relief from the suffering of such sensitiveness in deliberate, studied expression of it. . . . To phrase an emotional mood an artist must, as it were, cut his nature in two. With part of himself he must cling to the mood in question, or at least revive it at will. With another part of himself he must deliberately withdraw from the mood, observe it, criticise it, and carefully seek the vehicle of expression which shall best serve to convey it to other minds than his own. . . . Undoubtedly this process is not always conscious. Beyond question, remarkable artistic effects are sometimes produced by methods which seem to the artist spontaneous. Such effects, however, wonderful though they be, are in a sense rather accidental than masterly; and whatever else the art of Sh.'s Sonnets may be called, it is beyond doubt masterly, not accidental.

. . . What they express, in terms of emotional moods, cannot be much questioned. The real doubt, after all, concerns only what caused these moods; and that is a question rather of gossip and of scandal, of impertinent curiosity, than of criticism. What the Sonnets surely express — what no criticism can take from us — is the eagerness, the restlessness, the eternally sweet suffering of a lover whose love is of this world. Love, sacred or profane, idealizes its object. If this object be earthly or human, experience must finally shatter the ideal. Religion is a certainty only because the object of its love is a pure ideal, which nothing but change of faith can alter. So long as any human being cares passionately for anything not purely ideal, so long will he surely find life tragic. The lasting tragedy of earthly love, then, is what the Sonnets phrase; and this they phrase in no impersonal terms, but rather in the language of one whose temperament, as you grow year by year to know it better, stands out as individual as any in literature. . . . The deep depression, the acute suffering, the fierce passion which should normally result from what we have seen, Sh. seems fully to have known. Instead of expressing it, however, in such wild outbursts as one might naturally expect, he displays throughout a power of self-mastery, which gives his every utterance, no matter how passionate, the beauty of restrained and mastered artistic form.

(*William Shakspere*, pp. 226–36.)

GEORGE WYNDHAM: [Sh.'s] poetic themes are figured and displayed throughout the Sonnets by means of an imagery which, as in *V. & A.* and *Lucrece*, is often so vividly seized and so minutely presented as to engross attention to the prejudice of the theme. Indeed, at some times the poet himself seems rather the quarry than the pursuer of his own images—as it were a magician hounded by spirits of his summoning. Conceits were a fashion, and Sh. sometimes followed the fashion; but this characteristic of his lyrical verse is rather a passive consequence of such obsession than the result of any deliberate pursuit of an image until it becomes a conceit. Put "his" for "her," and in *Lucrece* he himself describes the process:

> Much like a press of people at a door,
> Throng *his* inventions which shall go before.

The retina of his mind's eye, like a child's, or that of a man feverish from the excitement of some high day, is as it were a shadow-sheet, on which images received long since revive and grow to the very act and radiancy of life. . . . Taine insists, perhaps too exclusively, on the vivid imagery of Sh.'s verse; Minto and Mrs. Meynell, perhaps too exclusively, on the magic of sound and association which springs from his unexpected collocation of words till then unmated. The truth seems to lie in a fusion of the two theories. When Sh. takes his images from nature, the first excellence is predominant; the second, when he takes them from the occupations of men. Often, in the Sonnets, he illustrates his theme with images from inheritance, or usury, or the law; and then his effects are rather produced by the successful impressment of technical terms to the service of poetry than by the recollections they revive of legal processes:

> When to the sessions of sweet silent thought
> I summon up remembrance of things past.

Among such occupations he draws also upon journeys (50), navigation (80, 86, 116), husbandry (3), medicine (118), sieges (2), and a courtier's career (7, 114). . . . He draws also on the arts of painting (frequently), of music (8, 128), of the stage (23); on the dark sciences [14, 15, 107]; on alchemy (33) and distillation [5, 6, 54, 119]. When, as in these examples, he takes his illustrations from professions and occupations, or from arts and sciences, his magic, no doubt, is mainly verbal; but it springs from immediate perception (as in the case of annual and diurnal changes), when his images are taken from subtler effects of sensuous appreciation, be it of shadows, of the transparency of windows (3, 24), of reflections in mirrors (3, 22, 62, 77, 103), or of hallucinations in the dark [27, 43, 61]. And this source of his magic is evident also, when, as frequently, he makes use of jewels (27, 34, 48, 52, 65, 96), apparel (2, 26, 76), the rose (1, 35, 54, 67, 95, 99, 109), the grave (1, 4, 6, 17, 31, 32, 71, 72, 77, 81), sepulchral monuments (55, 81, 107), the alternation of sunshine with showers (33, 34), the singing of birds (29), and their silence (97, 102). Realism is the note of these imaginative perceptions, as it is when he writes:

> 'T is not enough that through the cloud thou break
> To dry the rain on my storm-beaten face;

[and 23, 1–2; 50, 5–6; 60, 1; 73, 2–3]; when he instances the "dyer's hand" (111) and the "crow that flies in heaven's sweetest air" (70) — a clue to carrion — or when he captures a vivid scene of nursery comedy (143). In all such passages the magic springs from imaginative observation rather than from unexpected verbal collocutions. And, while this observation is no less keen, the rendering of it no less faithful, than in the earlier lyrical poems, *conceits*, though still to be found, are fewer: e.g., of the eye and heart (24, 46, 47), of the four elements — earth, air, fire, water (44, 45), and of the taster to a king (114).

On the other hand, the eloquent discourse of the earlier poems becomes the staple of the Sonnets and their highest excellence. It is for this that we chiefly read them. . . . The charm of Sh.'s verbal surprises — e.g., "a lass unparalleled," "multitudinous seas," instanced by Mrs. Meynell — once noted, is readily recognized, but much of his verbal melody defies analysis. Yet some of it, reminding you of Chaucer's "divine liquidness of diction, his divine fluidity of movement," * . . . may be explained by that absolute mastery he had over the rhythmical use of our English accent. . . . No other English poet lets the accent fall so justly in accord with the melody of his rhythm and the emphasis of his speech, or meets it with a greater variety of subtly affiliated sounds. . . . [Take Sonnet 1,] and you observe (1) the use of kindred sounds, of alliteration or of assonance or of both, to mark the principal stresses in any one line; e.g., line 1, *crea*tures and in*crea*se, where both are used; line 3, *rip*er and *t*ime; line 4, *heir* and *bear;* line 5, con*trac*ted and *bright;* line 9, *Thou* and *now;* — and (2), and this is most characteristic, the juxtaposition of assonantal sounds where two syllables consecutive, but in separate words, are accented with a marked pause between them: e.g., line 5, br*i*ght *ey*es; line 8, *too* cr*u*el; line 11, b*u*d b*u*riest; line 12, m*ak*'st w*a*ste. Mr. Patmore points out (Essay on English Metrical Law) that "ordinary English phrases exhibit a great preponderance of emphatic and unemphatic syllables in consecutive couples," and our eighteenth century poets, absorbed in metre and negligent of varied rhythm, traded on this feature of our tongue to produce a number of dull iambic lines by the use of their banal trochaic epithets, "balmy," "mazy," and the rest. Sh. constantly varies his rhythm in the Sonnets, and frequently by this bringing of two accented syllables together, with a pause between. But, when he does so, he ensures a correct delivery by affiliating the two syllables in sound, and prefixing to the first a delaying word which precludes any scamping of the next ensuing accent: e.g., "own" before "bright eyes," "self" before "too cruel," "churl" before "mak'st waste." Cf. "earth" before "sings hymns" in 29, 12; and 15, 8: "and *wear their brave state* out of memory."

It is by this combination of accent with rhyme that Sh. links the lines of each quatrain in his Sonnets into one perfect measure. If you except two [116 and 129], you find that he does not, as Milton did afterwards, build up his sonnet, line upon line, into one monumental whole: he writes three lyrical quatrains, with a pronounced pause after the second and a couplet after the third. Taking the first sonnet once more, you observe (3) the binding together of the lines

* Matthew Arnold.

in each quatrain by passing on a kindred sound from the last, or most important, accent in one line to the first, or most important, in the next: e.g., from 2 to 3, from *die* to *riper* by assonance; from 2 to 4, from *time* to *tender* by alliteration; from 6 to 7, from *fuel* to *famine;* [etc.] Cf. 60, 6–7:

*C*rawls to maturity, wherewith being *c*rown'd
*C*rooked eclipses 'gainst his glory fight.

. . . (4) For a further binding together of the quatrain the rhyme, or last syllable, though not accented, is often tied by assonance to the first syllable, though not accented, of the next line: e.g., lines 3, 4, *decease — his;* lines 7, 8, *lies — thyself;* lines 10, 11, *Spring — within;* lines 12, 13, *niggarding — pity.* Sh.'s effects of alliteration, apart from this use of them for the binding together of the quatrain, are at some times of astonishing strength:

When rocks impregnable are not so *st*out
Nor ga*t*es of *st*eel so *st*rong but Time decays; (65, 7–8)

and at others of a strange sweetness:

The *w*orld *w*ill be thy *w*idow and still *weep.* (9, 5)

Again, at others he uses the device antithetically in discourse:

Were it not thy *sour leisure* gave *sweet leave;* (39, 10)

and his rhythm is at all times infinitely varied; [cf. 19, 14; 33, 7; 86, 4; 11, 10.]

. . . Works of perfect art are the tombs in which artists lay to rest the passions they would fain make immortal. The more perfect their execution, the longer does the sepulchre endure, the sooner does the passion perish. Only where the hand has faltered do ghosts of love and anguish still complain. In the most of his Sonnets Sh.'s hand does not falter. The wonder of them lies in the art of his poetry, not in the accidents of his life; and, within that art, not so much in his choice of poetic themes as in the wealth of his imagery, which grows and shines and changes: above all, in the perfect execution of his verbal melody. That is the body of which his imagery is the soul, and the two make one creation so beautiful that we are not concerned with anything but its beauty.

(*Poems of Sh.*, Introduction, pp. cxxxii–cxlvii.)

GEORGE BRANDES: It has been insisted that love for a beautiful youth, which the study of Plato had presented to the men of the Renaissance in its most attractive light, was a standing theme among English poets of that age, who, moreover, as in Sh.'s case, were wont to praise the beauty of their friend above that of their mistress. The woman, too, as in this case, often enters as a disturbing element into the relation. It was an accepted part of the convention that the poet should represent himself as withered and wrinkled, whatever his real age might be; Sh. does so again and again, though he was at most thirty-seven. Finally, it was quite in accordance with use and wont that the fair youth should be exhorted to marry, so that his beauty might not die with him. Sh. had already placed such exhortations in the mouth of the Goddess of Love in *V. & A.* . . .

All this is true, and yet there is no reasonable ground for doubting that the Sonnets stand in pretty close relation to actual facts. The age, indeed, determines the tone, the coloring, of the expressions in which friendship clothes itself. In Germany and Denmark, at the end of the eighteenth century, friendship was a sentimental enthusiasm, just as in England and Italy during the sixteenth century it took the form of platonic love. We can clearly discern, however, that the different methods of expression answered to corresponding shades of difference in the emotion itself. The men of the Renaissance gave themselves up to an adoration of friendship and of their friend which is now unknown, except in circles where a perverted sexuality prevails. Montaigne's friendship for Estienne de la Boëtie, and Languet's passionate tenderness for the youthful Philip Sidney, are cases in point. Sir Thomas Browne writes in his *Religio Medici* (1642): "I never yet cast a true affection on a woman; but I have loved my friend as I do virtue, my soul, my God. . . . I love my friend before myself, and yet, methinks, I do not love him enough: some few months hence my multiplied affection will make me believe I have not loved him at all. When I am from him, I am dead till I be with him; when I am with him, I am not satisfied, but would still be nearer him." But the most remarkable example of a frenzied friendship in Renaissance culture and poetry is undoubtedly to be found in Michael Angelo's letters and sonnets. Michael Angelo's relation to Messer Tommaso de' Cavalieri presents the most interesting parallel to the attitude which Sh. adopted towards William Herbert. We find the same expressions of passionate love from the older to the younger man; but here it is still more unquestionably certain that we have not to do with mere poetical figures of speech, since the letters are not a whit less ardent and enthusiastic than the sonnets. The expressions in the sonnets are sometimes so warm that Michael Angelo's nephew, in his edition of them, altered the word *Signiore* into *Signora*, and these poems, like Sh.'s, were for some time supposed to have been addressed to a woman. (Ludwig von Scheffler: *Michel Angelo.* 1892.)

. . . As regards the form, the first and most obvious remark is that, in spite of their name, these poems are not in reality sonnets at all, and have, indeed, nothing in common with the sonnet except their fourteen lines. In the structure of his so-called Sonnets Sh. simply followed the tradition and convention of his country. . . . The chief defect in Sh.'s Sonnets as a metrical whole consists in the appended couplet, which hardly ever keeps up to the level of the beginning, hardly ever presents any picture to the eye, but is, as a rule, merely reflective, and often brings the burst of feeling which animates the poem to a feeble, or at any rate more rhetorical than poetic, issue.

In actual poetic value the Sonnets are extremely uneven. The first group undoubtedly stands lowest in the scale, with its seventeen times repeated and varied exhortation to the friend to leave the world a living reproduction of his beauty. They necessarily express but little of the poet's personal feeling. . . . The last two Sonnets in the collection, dealing with a conventional theme borrowed from the antique, are likewise entirely impersonal. . . . Next in order stand the Sonnets of merely conventional inspiration, those in which the eye and

heart go to law with each other, or in which the poet plays upon his own name and his friend's. These cannot possibly claim any high poetic value. But the poems thus set apart form but a small minority of the collection. In all the others the waves of feeling run high, and it may be said in general that the deeper the sentiment and the stronger the emotion they express, the more admirable is their force of diction and their marvelous melody. There are Sonnets whose musical quality is unsurpassed by any of the songs introduced into the plays, or even by the most famous and beautiful speeches in the plays themselves. The free and lax form he had adopted was of evident advantage to Sh. The triple and quadruple rhymes, which in Italian involve scarcely any difficulty or constraint, would have proved very hampering in English. As a matter of fact, Sh. has been able to follow out every inspiration unimpeded by the shackles of an elaborate rhyme-scheme, and has achieved a rare combination of terseness and harmony in the expression of sorrow, melancholy, anguish, and resignation. . . .

Sh.'s Sonnets are for the general reader the most inaccessible of his works, but they are also the most difficult to tear oneself away from. . . . The reader who can reconcile himself to the fact that great geniuses are not necessarily models of correctness will pass a very different judgment [from Browning's "the less Shakespeare he."] He will follow with eager interest the experiences which rent and harrowed Sh.'s soul. He will rejoice in the insight afforded by these poems, which the crowd ignores, into the tempestuous emotional life of one of the greatest of men. Here, and here alone, we see Sh. himself, as distinct from his poetical creations, loving, admiring, longing, yearning, adoring, disappointed, humiliated, tortured. Here more than anywhere else can we, who at a distance of three centuries do homage to the poet's art, feel ourselves in intimate communion, not only with the poet, but with the man.

(*William Shakespeare*, 1: 342–56.)

Thomas R. Price: So soon as the world ceases to seek in the sonnets for morbid details of the poet's biography, and for the revelation of his adventures and intrigues, those poems assume their true value as works of art. And, if the stages of a poet's artistic development be in truth the vital facts of a poet's life, then the sonnets become of monumental worth, stages in the attainment of his perfect art, the training-school of his transcendent genius for poetic form. They are the abiding record of his studies in poetry. . . . In essence . . . the sonnets are as purely and intensely dramatic as the dramas themselves. There is, under the lyrical form, the same movement and process of the imagination. For, in each drama, each dramatic speech that the poet creates is the utterance, as conceived by the poet, of some imagined person as evoked by some imagined situation. . . . And in the sonnets, in like manner, for the creation of each sonnet, there is the situation that the poet imagines and the personality that he poses in the situation. Thus, in fitting dramatically the style, in all its details of language and versification, to the character and to the situation as he imagined them, he struck the deepest fountain of lyrical inspiration.

Hence the infinite variety and impersonality of the sonnets themselves. Sh. made of them, in the mighty studies of his youth, no trivial revelation of women that had kissed him nor of friends that had betrayed him, but the generalized utterance of human passion. The characters that he imagined were so placed in a series of imaginary situations, as to exhibit, in the widest possible range of emotion, the full play of the human soul. . . .

For Sh. himself, as for all the great writers of his time, the chief problem of style, in the poetic handling of their English language, was the dainty choice of words. . . . In Sh., within the compass of the sonnets, the chief character to be noted is the wide range of his choice, the flexibility of his style. In all the sonnets taken together, there is the average of $16\frac{3}{4}$ per cent of foreign words to $83\frac{1}{4}$ per cent of native words. But in separate sonnets, and in groups of sonnets, there is large divergence from this normal average. The percentage of foreign words, at its lowest, falls to $7\frac{1}{2}$ per cent, and at its highest rises to $26\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. . . . The sonnets that show the largest excess of foreign diction are 107, 125, 15, 66, 85, 129, 127, 4, 8. The sonnets in which the diction is purest are 43, 73, 22, 24, 42, 61, 9, 72, 92, 140. Several in each class are supremely beautiful. They show with what skill the poet knew how to secure the tone of his emotion. . . .

The leading words of each verse were chosen habitually for their delicate alliterative harmony with one another. In composing the sonnets [Sh.] became, as we shall see, almost infallible in the proper placing of the cæsural pause. Thus, as the result of the cæsura was to cut the verse into two halves, he felt, like the older poets, the need of linking the two parts by most ingenious harmonies of sound. In many cases, this could be done without formal alliteration, by the correspondence of his accented vowels. Apart from this means, and apart from those innumerable cases in which alliteration is used only to decorate a single half-verse, there is in the sonnets careful alliteration of verse-structure in 38 per cent of his verses. In general, Sh. confines the process to the single verse; but in some sonnets he binds together by alliteration groups of verses, e.g., 82, 10–11; 71, 2–3; 135, 1–2; 127, 2–3–4; 109, 6–7. . . .

In almost all sonnets there is lack of lucidity in syntax, lack of logical precision in the arrangement of sentences, either a too violent compression of the thought to be expressed or an excessive looseness and prolixity. It is here that the young Sh. shows the supreme mastery of his art. For him, the perfect pose of his thought upon the "sonnet's Procrustean bed" reveals neither cramping nor stretching. Except in two or three passages, where the text is doubtful, the syntax of the sonnets is faultless and even luminous. He has solved in his sonnet-composition not only the problem of choosing and grouping his sentences according to their sensuous rhythm, but also the problem of constructing and grouping his sentences according to their intellectual relations. Thus, in the best of the sonnets, above all in those in which he has revealed the fulness of his imaginative power, there is the attainment of the highest poetic harmony, the harmony of cadence with emotion and truth of thought. . . .

The last and the highest point of view from which the poetical style of Sh.

is to be studied, so far as displayed in the sonnets, is the extent to which his vocabulary is penetrated and colored by his imagination. For, according to the purpose to be attained, words are to be chosen either because they involve the figure and thus transfer the movement of the imagination, or because, being so far as possible freed of figure, they make their appeal only to the pure reason. It is in making this choice of words between the limits thus given, that the style of Sh. shows the infinite range of its emotional variation. There are in fact, within the group of sonnets, intermingled with each other, two sets of poems formed on principles of art that are fundamentally diverse. On the one hand, composed with the highest attainable splendor of imaginative diction, there are poems formed of verses that are made each to sparkle and coruscate with brilliant touches of natural poetry. On the other hand, composed in words from which all touch of figure is carefully withheld, there are poems in which the subtle play of pure thought, rising sometimes into ingenious conceit, is made to take the place of imaginative fervor. Whether a poem belongs to the one or to the other class may be roughly tested by the presence or the absence of consciously suggested figure. Thus among the sonnets there are 45 that may be fairly described as purposely left bare of figure and of imaginative decoration. And there are 44 others in which the play of figure is, except upon close analysis, almost invisible. . . . Intermingled with these 89 there are 21 others that are unsurpassed in human literature for their concentrated splendor of poetical imagery. In them the poet, instead of developing a curious thought, embodies an overwhelming emotion, in symbols and figures of natural beauty, drawn from all the sources of the poetical imagination. Watch, for example, the magical effect of Sonnet 33, as, full-orbed in radiance, it falls into its place after the more subdued harmonies of 30, 31, and 32. And so, again, Sonnet 73, with its incomparable fulness of sensuous charm, is set, like a precious gem, between the almost unadorned movements of Sonnets 72 and 74. Between the two extremes that have been defined and exhibited, there are 44 sonnets that partake, in ever shifting degrees, of both characters. They are poems in which, while there is more or less development of natural figure, there is also the purely psychological delight in situation and dramatic movement.

("The Technic of Sh.'s Sonnets," *Studies in Honor of Basil L. Gildersleeve*, pp. 363–75.)

H. C. Beeching: The form of quatorzain invariably used by Sh. for his sonnets was not the strict Petrarchan form, but one in three quatrains and a couplet; devised, it is believed, by the Earl of Surrey, who wrote in it at least one memorable sonnet, "The soote season which bud and bloom forth brings." Surrey's example seems to have had weight with the Elizabethan critics, for as early as 1575, i.e. before any of Daniel's sonnets had appeared, we find George Gascoigne defining the sonnet as "a poem of fourteen lines, every line containing ten syllables, the first twelve rhyming in staves of four lines by cross metre, and the last two rhyming together." The publication, however, of Sidney's *Astrophel & Stella* (1591) drew attention once more to the Italian

form with its marked division into octave and sestet, and both Daniel and Barnes, whose sonnets immediately followed (1592–1593), used this form occasionally, while Constable used it always. It is therefore significant that Sh. should have preferred the form devised by Surrey. I cannot do better than quote here some remarks made on this point by Mr. Bowyer Nichols* in refutation of the idea put forward by Mark Pattison that Sh. blundered into this form "without any suspicion that there existed a better type":

"Whether Sh. could read Italian and French may still be disputed, though it is tolerably certain that he had a working acquaintance with them both. He may or may not have read Petrarch and Desportes; certainly he did not borrow wholesale in the fashion of contemporaries. He must at any rate have been perfectly familiar with the Italian type of the sonnet in the work of his fellow-countrymen. . . . It could not have been ignorance or accident (as it might have been with lesser men like Barnes or Griffin) which prevented the greatest of English sonneteers from using what he must have recognised to be the ideally more perfect form. The only explanation seems to be that he considered the form evolved by Surrey and other English poets to have on the whole for English practice the advantage. He judged, as we may believe, that the classic symmetry of the Petrarchan sonnet was in English too difficult of attainment, that it cramped invention, and imposed too many sacrifices and concessions; and that the artistic end could better be achieved in the inferior medium.† And indeed, as a matter of fact, he gets nearer to the Petrarchan quality than any other sonneteer in the dignity, sweetness, variety, and freedom of his effects. . . . One word may be said as to the final couplet. There is no doubt that, to an ear attuned to the Italian scheme, this is a disturbing element. It has an over-emphatic and epigrammatic effect. It has also this effect, at any rate in most Elizabethan writing, that the most marked rhythmical break comes at the end of the three quatrains, at the twelfth instead of, as in the Italian, at the eighth line. Nevertheless the couplet has great expressive character, and it sums up the situation or feeling in a way that no other form could do:

> Now if thou wouldst, when all have given him over
> From death to life thou mightst him yet recover.

and

> If this be error and upon me proved,
> I never writ nor no man ever loved.

Keats, following certain elder examples, when he uses the Elizabethan form, runs on the sense from the third stanza into the couplet; but it would seem really most in consonance with the genius of the form frankly to make the pause at the twelfth line, and this Sh., I think, always does." ‡

. . . The reader who passes from the *V. & A.* or *Lucrece* to the Sonnets undoubtedly perceives a difference in point of style, but it is not so easy to describe

* *A Little Book of Sonnets*, Introduction, p. xviii.

† Mr. Nichols notes that the choice and practice of Sh. are confirmed by Keats, whose earlier sonnets were Italian in form, but the later Shakespearean.

‡ The one exception seems to be S. 35.

as the corresponding change that came over Sh.'s method of writing blank verse, which can, to a certain extent, be formulated, especially in regard to the position of the pause. In the sonnets, as in the poems, the pause comes regularly at the end of the line, and a central pause is rare, though it is occasionally found; for instance in 63, 4; 104, 3; 116, 2. The difference between the poems and the sonnets is largely a difference of substance; the latter impress us as the work of a maturer mind. The poems, with all their beauty, are somewhat thin; the matter seems stretched out to fit the form; while in the sonnets the mould of form is exactly filled; thought has deepened; passion has taken the place of rhetoric, and limpidity is exchanged for richness. If we would find a parallel in the plays to the balance of style and substance, thought and imagination, that is so striking in the greater number of the sonnets, we must turn not to the rhymed scenes of the early plays but to the more lyrical passages of the blank verse in the poet's middle period; to such lines, for instance, as these from the *M.V.*:

> A day in April never came so sweet,
> To show how costly summer was at hand,
> As this fore-spurrer comes before his lord (II, ix, 93–95);

or these, from the same play:

> There's not the smallest orb which thou behold'st
> But in his motion like an angel sings,
> Still quiring to the young-eyed cherubins (V, 60–62).

(*Sonnets of Sh.*, Introduction, pp. xlviii–li.)

Sidney Lee: Though Sh.'s sonnets are unequal in literary merit, many reach levels of lyric melody and meditative energy which are not to be matched elsewhere in poetry. Numerous lines like

> Gilding pale streams with heavenly alchemy

or

> When to the sessions of sweet silent thought

seem to illustrate the perfection of human utterance. If a few of the poems sink into inanity beneath the burden of quibbles and conceits, others are almost overcharged with the mellowed sweetness of rhythm and metre, the depth of thought and feeling, the vividness of imagery, and the stimulating fervour of expression which are the finest fruits of poetic power.

. . . In spite of the vagueness of intention which envelops some of the poems, and the slenderness of the links which bind together many consecutive sonnets, the whole collection is well calculated to create the illusion of a series of earnest personal confessions. The collection has consequently been often treated as a self-evident excerpt from the poet's autobiography. . . . But any strictly literal or autobiographical interpretation has to meet a formidable array of difficulties. Two general objections present themselves on the threshold of the discussion. In the first place, the autobiographic interpretation is to a large extent in conflict with the habit of mind and method of work which

are disclosed in the rest of Sh.'s achievement. In the second place, it credits the poet with humiliating experiences of which there is no hint elsewhere.

On the first point, little more needs saying than that Sh.'s mind was dominated and engrossed by genius for drama, and that, in view of his supreme mastery of dramatic power, the likelihood that any production of his pen should embody a genuine piece of autobiography is on *a priori* grounds small. Robert Browning, no mean psychologist, went so far as to assert that Sh. "ne'er so little" at any point of his work left his "bosom's gate ajar," and declared him incapable of unlocking his heart "with a sonnet-key." That the energetic fervour which animates many of Sh.'s sonnets should bear the living semblance of private ecstasy or anguish, is no confutation of Browning's view. No critic of insight has denied all tie of kinship between the fervour of the sonnets and the passion which is portrayed in the tragedies. The passion of the tragedies is invariably the dramatic or objective expression, in the vividest terms, of emotional experience, which, however common in human annals, is remote from the dramatist's own interest or circumstance. Even his two narrative poems, as Coleridge pointed out, betray "the utter aloofness of the poet's own feelings from those of which he is at once the painter and the analyst." Certainly the intense passion of the tragedies is never the mere literal presentment of the author's personal or subjective emotional experience, nor does it draw sustenance from episodes in his immediate environment. The personal note in the sonnets may well owe much to that dramatic instinct which could reproduce intuitively the subtlest thought and feeling of which man's mind is capable.

The particular course and effect of the emotion, which Sh. portrayed in drama, were usually suggested or prescribed by some story in an historic chronicle or work of fiction. The detailed scheme of the sonnets seems to stand on something of the same footing as the plots of his plays. The sonnets weave together and develop with the finest poetic and dramatic sensibility themes which had already served, with inferior effect, the purposes of poetry many times before. The material for the subject-matter and the suggestion of the irregular emotion of the sonnets lay at Sh.'s command in much literature by other pens. The obligation to draw on his personal experiences for his theme or its development was little greater in his sonnets than in his dramas. Hundreds of sonneteers had celebrated, in the language of love, the charms of young men — mainly by way of acknowledging their patronage in accordance with a convention which was peculiar to the period of the Renaissance. Thousands of poets had described their sufferings at the hands of imperious beauty. Others had found food for poetry in stories of mental conflict caused by a mistress's infidelity or a friend's coolness. The spur of example never failed to incite Sh.'s dramatic muse to activity, and at no period of literary history was the presentation of amorous adventures more often essayed in sonnets than by Sh.'s poetic contemporaries at home and abroad during the last decade of the 16th century. . . . To few of the sonnets can a controlling artistic impulse be denied by criticism. The best of them rank with the richest and

most concentrated efforts of Sh.'s pen. To pronounce them, alone of his extant work, free of that "feigning" which he identified with "the truest poetry," is tantamount to denying his authorship of them, and to dismissing them from the Shakespearean canon.

The second general objection which is raised by the theory of the sonnets' autobiographic significance can be stated very briefly. A literal interpretation of the poems credits the poet with a moral instability which is at variance with the tone of all the rest of his work, and is rendered barely admissible by his contemporary reputation for "honesty." Of the "pangs of despised love" for a woman, which he professes to suffer in the sonnets, nothing need be said in this connection. But a purely literal interpretation of the impassioned protestations of affection for a "lovely boy," which course through the sonnets, casts a slur on the dignity of the poet's name which scarcely bears discussion. Of friendship of the healthy manly type, not his plays alone, but the records of his biography, give fine and touching examples. All his dramatic writing, as well as his two narrative poems and the testimonies of his intimate associates in life, seems to prove him incapable of such a personal confession of morbid infatuation with a youth, as a literal interpretation discovers in the sonnets.

It is in the light not merely of æsthetic appreciation but of contemporary literary history that Sh.'s sonnets must be studied, if one hopes to reach any conclusions as to their precise significance which are entitled to confidence. . . . Of chief importance is it to realize that the whole vocabulary of affection — the commonest terms of endearment — often carried with them in Renaissance or Elizabethan poetry, and especially in Renaissance and Elizabethan sonnets, a poetic value that is wholly different from any that they bear to-day. The example of Tasso, the chief representative of the Renaissance on the continent of Europe in Sh.'s day, shows with singular lucidity how the language of love was suffered deliberately to clothe the conventional relations of poet to a helpful patron. Tasso not merely recorded in sonnets an apparently amorous devotion for his patron, the Duke of Ferrara, which is only intelligible in its historical environment, but he also carefully describes in prose the precise sentiments which, with a view to retaining the ducal favour, he sedulously cultivated and poetized. In a long prose letter to a later friend and patron, the Duke of Urbino, he wrote of his attitude of mind to his first patron thus: "I confided in him, not as we hope in men, but as we trust in God. . . . It appeared to me, so long as I was under his protection, fortune and death had no power over me. Burning thus with devotion to my lord, as much as man ever did with love to his mistress, I became, without perceiving it, almost an idolater." (Tasso, *Opere*, Pisa, 1821–32, 13: 298.) . . . There is practical identity between the alternations of feeling which find touching voice in many of the sonnets of Sh. and those which colour Tasso's confession of his intercourse with his Duke of Ferrara. Both poets profess for a man a lover-like idolatry. Both attest the hopes and fears which his favour evokes in them, with a fervour and intensity of emotion which it was only in the power of great poets to feign.

(*Sh.'s Sonnets*, Facsimile edition, 1905, Introduction, pp. 7–13.)

WALTER RALEIGH: These Sonnets, by general consent, were private documents; they were not intended by Sh. for our perusal, but were addressed to individuals. To say that they do not "express his own feelings in his own person" is as much as to say that they are not sincere. And every lover of poetry who has once read the Sonnets knows this to be untrue. It is not chiefly their skill that takes us captive, but the intensity of their quiet personal appeal. By virtue of this they hold their place with the greatest poetry in the world; they are rich in metaphor and various in melody, but these resources of art have been subdued to the feeling that inspires them, and have given us poems as simple and as moving as the pleading voice of a child.

. . . No one whose opinion need be considered will maintain that Sh.'s Sonnets are destitute of feeling. Some, whose opinions claim respect, maintain that the feeling which inspires them has nothing to do with their ostensible occasions: that they are free exercises of the poetic fancy, roaming over the dramatic possibilities of life, and finding deep expression for some of its imagined crises. Those who hold this view have not taken the trouble to explain how some of the sonnets came to be addressed or sent to any one. . . . If the sonnets were never sent, how did Thorpe get hold of them? If they were circulated among disinterested lovers of poetry, would not some of them, which deal not with general themes, but with personal relations quite inadequately explained, be as unintelligible to contemporary readers as they are to us? These are not self-contained poems, like Daniel's sonnet on Sleep, or Sidney's sonnet on the Moon; they are a commentary on certain implied events. If the events had no existence, and the sonnets are semi-dramatic poems, it is surely essential to good drama that the situation should be made clear. Moreover, the sonnet form was used by the Elizabethans, who followed their master Petrarch, exclusively for poems expressive of personal feeling, not for vague dramatic fantasies.

. . . Poetry is not biography; and the value of the Sonnets to the modern reader is independent of all knowledge of their occasion. That they were made from the material of experience is certain: Sh. was not a puny imitative rhymester. But the processes of art have changed the tear to a pearl, which remains to decorate new sorrows. The Sonnets speak to all who have known the chances and changes of human life. Their occasion is a thing of the past; their theme is eternal. The tragedy of which they speak is the topic and inspiration of all poetry; it is the triumph of Time, marching relentlessly over the ruin of human ambitions and human desires. It may be read in all nature and in all art. . . . All things decay; the knowledge is as old as time, and as dull as philosophy. But what a poignancy it takes from its sudden recognition by the heart:

> Then of thy beauty do I question make,
> That thou among the wastes of time must go.

. . . The poems of Sh. in no way modify that conception of his character and temper which a discerning reader might gather from the evidence of the plays. But they let us hear his voice more directly, without the intervening barrier

of the drama, and they furnish us with some broken hints of the stormy trials and passions which helped him to his knowledge of the human heart, and enriched his plays with the fruits of personal experience.

(*Shakespeare*, pp. 87–93.)

GEORGE SAINTSBURY: [In the Sonnets Sh.] has a medium which is absolutely congenial to him, and with which, as with blank verse, he can do anything he likes. With his usual sagacity he chooses the English form, and prefers its extremest variety — that of the three quatrains and couplet, without any interlacing rhyme. Nevertheless he gives the full sonnet-effect — not merely by the distribution (which he does not always observe, though he often does) of octave and sestet *subject*, but very mainly by that same extraordinary symphonising of the prosodic effects of individual and batched verses, which was his secret in blank verse itself. If it seem surprising that so difficult and subtle a medium should be mastered so early, let it be remembered that the single-line mould, properly used, is by no means unsuitable to the sonnet, the effect of which is definitely cumulative. . . . It is by this combined cumulative and diversifying effect, this beating up against the wind as it were, that the ordinary and extraordinary "tower" of these sonnets is produced; and this tower is to some readers their great and inexhaustible charm. No matter what the subject is, the "man right fair" or "the woman coloured ill," the incidents of daily joy and chagrin, or those illimitable meditations on life and love and thought at large which eternise the more ephemeral things, — the process, prosodic and poetic, is more or less the same, though carefully kept from monotony. In the very first lines there is the spread and beating of the wing; the flight rises till the end of the douzain, when it stoops or sinks quietly to the close in the couplet. The intermediate devices by which this effect is produced are, as always with Sh., hard to particularise. Here, as in the kindred region of pure style, he has so little mannerism, that it is easier to apprehend than to analyse his manner. It may be a concidence, or it may not, that in a very large proportion of the openings what we may call a bastard cæsura, or ending of a word without much metrical scission at the third syllable, precedes a strictly metrical one at the fourth. (In other words the fourth half-foot is constantly monosyllabic. "Look in thy glass" (S. 3) is the first, and there are a dozen others in the first two dozen sonnets.) Another point is that, throughout, full stops or their equivalents in mid-line are extremely rare, and even at the end not common, till the twelfth, so that the run of the whole is uninterrupted, though its rhythm is constantly diversified. Redundant syllables are very rare, except where, as in 87, they are accumulated with evident purpose. The trisyllabic foot, though used with wonderful effect sometimes, is used very sparingly. On the whole Sh. seems here to have had for his object, or at any rate to have achieved as his effect, the varying of the line with as little as possible breach or ruffling of it. He allows himself a flash or blaze of summer lightning now and then, but no fussing with continual crackers. All the prosodic handling is subdued to give that steady passionate musing — that

"emotion recollected in tranquillity" — which is characteristic of the best sonnets, and of his more than almost of any others.

(*History of English Prosody*, 2: 59–61.)

It is possible to lay rather too much stress on the possibility of there being no interpretation at all or very little; of the Sonnets being merely, or mainly, literary exercises. It is, of course, perfectly true that the form, at this time, was an extremely fashionable exercise; and, no doubt, in some cases, a fashionable exercise merely. It is further true that, great as are the poetical merits and capacities of the sonnet, historically it has been, and from its nature was almost fated to be, more the prey of "common form" than almost any other variety of poetic composition. The overpowering authority of Petrarch started this common form; and his Italian and French successors, enlarging it to a certain extent, stereotyped and conventionalized it even still more. It is perfectly possible to show, and has been well shown by Sidney Lee, that a great number, perhaps the majority, of sonnet phrases, sonnet thoughts, sonnet ornaments, are simply coin of the sonnet realm, which has passed from hand to hand through Italian, French and English, and circulates in the actual Elizabethan sonnet like actual coin in the body politic or like blood in the body physical. All this is true. But it must be remembered that all poetry deals more or less in this common form, this common coin, this circulating fluid of idea and image and phrase, and that it is the very *ethos*, nay, the very essence, of the poet to make the common as if it were not common. That Sh. does so here again and again, in whole sonnets, in passages, in lines, in separate phrases, there is a tolerable agreement of the competent. But we may, without rashness, go a little further even than this. That Sh. had, as perhaps no other man has had, the dramatic faculty, the faculty of projecting from himself things and persons which were not himself, will certainly not be denied here. But whether he could create and keep up such a presentation of apparently authentic and personal passion as exhibits itself in these Sonnets is a much more difficult question to answer in the affirmative. The present writer is inclined to echo seriously a light remark of one of Thackeray's characters on a different matter: "Don't think he could do it. Don't think any one could do it." *

At the same time, it is of the first importance to recognize that the very intensity of feeling, combined, as it was, with the most energetic dramatic quality, would almost certainly induce complicated disguise and mystification in the details of the presentment. . . . To attempt to manufacture a biography of Sh. out of the Sonnets is to attempt to follow a will-o'-the-wisp. It is even extremely probable that a number, and perhaps a large number, of them do not correspond to any immediate personal occasion at all, or only owe a remote (and literally occasional) impulse thereto. The strong affection for the friend; the unbounded, though not uncritical, passion for the lady; and

* [The reverse of this argument is presented, though to the same effect, by H. D. Gray, *Publ. M. L. A.*, n.s., 23: 635: "If Sh. had been writing as much of a story as these sonnets tell, and writing it as an imaginary or a borrowed or reflected experience, this Prince of Dramatists would have done it better." I think Professor Gray's reasoning the more sound of the two. See also Bradley to the same effect, p. 413 below. — Ed.]

the establishment of a rather unholy "triangle" by a cross passion between these two — these are things which, without being capable of being affirmed as resting on demonstration, have a joint literary and psychological probability of the strongest kind. All things beyond, and all the incidents between, which may have started or suggested individual sonnets, are utterly uncertain. Browning was absolutely justified when he laid it down that, if Sh. unlocked his heart in the Sonnets, "the less Shakespeare he."

. . . The Sonnets have some mechanical, and many more not mechanical, peculiarities. The chief of the first class is a device of constantly, though not invariably, beginning with a strong cæsura at the fourth syllable, and a tendency, though the sonnet is built up of quatrains alternately rimed with final couplet, to put a still stronger stop at the end of the second line (where, as yet, is no rime), and at each second line of these non-completed couplets throughout. The piece is thus elaborately built up or accumulated, not, as sonnets on the octave and sestet system often are, more or less continuously wrought in each of their two divisions or even throughout. This arrangement falls in excellently with the intensely meditative character of the Sonnets. The poet seems to be exploring; feeling his way in the conflict of passion and meditation. As fresh emotions and meditations present themselves, he pauses over them, sometimes entertaining them only to reject them or to qualify them later; sometimes taking them completely to himself. Even in the most artificial, such as Sonnet 66, where almost the whole is composed of successive images of the wrong way of the world, each comprised in a line and in each beginning with "and," this accumulative character is noticeable; and it constitutes the strongest appeal of the greatest examples. While, at the same time, he avails himself to the full of the opportunity given by the English form for a sudden "turn" — antithetic, it may be, or it may be, rapidly summarizing — in the final couplet. . . .

The attraction of the Sonnets, almost more than that of any other poetry, consists in the perpetual subduing of everything in them — verse, thought, diction — to the requirements of absolutely perfect poetic expression. From the completest successes in which, from beginning to end, there is no weak point, such as [Sonnets 30 and 116,] through those which carry the perfection only part of the way, such as [Sonnet 106,] down to the separate batches of lines and clauses which appear in all but a very few, the peculiar infusing and transforming power of this poetical expression is shown after a fashion which it has proved impossible to outvie. The precise subject (or, perhaps, it would be more correct to say the precise object) of the verse disappears. It ceases to be a matter of the slightest interest whether it was Mr. W. H. or Mistress M. F. or anybody or nobody at all, so that we have only an abstraction which the poet chooses to regard as concrete. The best motto for the Sonnets would be one taken from not the least profound passage of the *Paradiso* of Dante:

> Qui si rimira nell' arte ch' adorna
> Con tanto affetto.

And this admiration of the art of beautiful expression not only dispenses the

reader from all the tedious, and probably vain, enquiries into particulars which have been glanced at, but positively makes him disinclined to pursue them.

(*Cambridge History of English Literature*, 5: 230–33.)

JULES J. JUSSERAND: It is open to the humblest of [Sh.'s] admirers to read [the Sonnets] without any preconceived opinion and to form their own unprejudiced judgment. They will find in them, somewhat as in all the master's works, a mixture of the exquisite and the hideous; pearls and mire; songs of love, triumphant or despairing, ideal or bestial; passionate accents so piercing that they cannot come, it seems, but from the heart; details that would have no interest if they were not taken from reality; and with that, conceits, word-plays, samples of clever craftsmanship, imitation of others, the working anew of those sonnet themes which, in that epoch of amourists, were common property; in short, a mixture of the real and the imaginary, such as is to be met with to some extent in all poets, including the most sincere, and which would have been recognized, no doubt, in Sh. too, were it not for his privilege of exciting sentiments excessive, passionate, and absolute. To believe that everything in his sonnets corresponds to the realities of his life, or to believe that nothing does, is equally venturesome. Because a poet puts in his verses a literary reminiscence, an irrevelant witticism, or because he takes up several times the same theme, some want him not to have felt anything: what a mistake! It happens to the truest poets, and the most sincerely moved, to hear their passion sing at various moments, in diverse keys, to transcribe several times its chant or plaint, and to mingle it too with distant strains, heard in days gone by, they know not where, nor from whose lips. But the prime mover has nevertheless been their passion. To admit that Sh.'s sonnets are mere literary exercises seems impossible, not only on account of their ring and tone, which bespeak realities (though this has been disputed), not only because it seems very improbable that such a sensitive nature never felt anything, and that, having felt something, he would have availed himself, when writing his lyrics, of his book learning rather than of his experience, but also because too many of the facts, details, and incidents inserted by him, are absolutely uninteresting if not true, and are, moreover, quite opposed to the æsthetics of the *genre*, to the *credo* of the amourist, of the poet who writes to exercise his pen. . . .

Something morbid exhales from these poems. The spirit of the Renaissance is clearly discernible in them, as well as an unconscious and involuntary platonism, the platonism of Plato, and not that of latter-day commentators, the real one, that which, for all that it rose as high as the clouds, none the less struck its roots beneath the miry earth. Here the roots are partly visible, and pagans never wrote anything more pagan than this series of sonnets. That which causes most of the poet's transports and ecstasies is the mere material beauty of his friend, the beauty of his eye, his lips, his hand, his foot. . . . Physical beauty is of such value that it secures its owner pardon for every sin; physical ugliness is the fault for which there is no remission. . . . As for the shadowy beyond, Sh. speaks of it in his sonnets, but in the same strains as Claudio or

Hamlet; he does not seem to have even their doubts; he will be "hid in death's dateless night"; to die is to go

From this vile world with vilest worms to dwell.

No allusion to a Christian paradise, not even to a possible meeting in classical Elysian Fields; he expresses here fewer hopes than the pagans themselves. If his spirit survives, it will be in the memory of his friend. . . . If his friend survives, it will be in his posterity and in the poet's sonnets. At that thought, a reaction takes place in him, as happens so easily in the changeful soul of artists; pessimism vanishes for a moment, and we have marvellous songs of triumph, bursting forth on the desolate moor strewn with lost illusions, among the graves of the churchyard where lie buried youth, hopes, virtues. He too disposes of that supreme gift, beauty; he can bestow that halo, the most splendid and durable of all; in his wretchedness, which in the abjection of his hours of gloom he fancied irremediable, he remembers that power which is his: what the blind fates above and the forces of nature cannot do, he can; he can bestow immortality. That thought is for him the main consolation; neither priests nor philosophers have taught him anything that could soothe his troubled heart; the Muse works this wonder, and dictates to him his finest lines.

(*A Literary History of the English People*, 3: 234–41.)

A. C. Bradley: The sonnets to the friend are, so far as we know, unique in Renaissance literature in being a prolonged and varied record of the intense affection of an older friend for a younger, and of other feelings arising from their relations. They have no real parallel in any series imitative of Virgil's second Eclogue, or in occasional sonnets to patrons or patron-friends couched in the high-flown language of the time. The intensity of the feelings expressed, however, ought not, by itself, to convince us that they are personal. The author of the plays could, I make no doubt, have written the most intimate of these poems to a mere creature of his imagination and without ever having felt them except in imagination. Nor is there any but an æsthetic reason why he could not have done so if he had wished. But an æsthetic reason there is; and this is the decisive point. No capable poet, much less a Sh., intending to produce a merely "dramatic" series of poems, would dream of inventing a story like that of these sonnets, or, even if he did, of treating it as they treat it. The story is very odd and unattractive. Such capacities as it has are but slightly developed. It is left obscure, and some of the poems are unintelligible to us because they contain allusions of which we can make nothing. . . . It is all unnatural, well-nigh incredibly unnatural, if, with the most skeptical critics, we regard the sonnets as a free product of mere imagination.*

. . . If then there is, as it appears, no obstacle of any magnitude to our taking the sonnets as substantially what they purport to be, we may naturally look in them for personal traits (and, indeed, to repeat a remark made earlier, we might still expect to find such traits even if we knew the sonnets to be purely

* I find that Mr. Beeching, in the Stratford Town edition of Sh. (1907), has also urged these considerations.

dramatic). But in drawing inferences we have to bear in mind what is implied by the qualification "substantially." We have to remember that *some* of these poems may be mere exercises of art; that all of them are poems, and not letters, much less affidavits; that they are Elizabethan poems; that the Elizabethan language of deference, and also of affection, is to our minds habitually extravagant and fantastic; and that in Elizabethan plays friends openly express their love for one another as Englishmen now rarely do. Allowance being made, however, on account of these facts, the sonnets will still leave two strong impressions — that the poet was exceedingly sensitive to the charm of beauty, and that his love for his friend was, at least at one time, a feeling amounting almost to adoration, and so intense as to be absorbing. . . . Most of us, I suppose, love any human being, of either sex and of any age, the better for being beautiful, and are not the least ashamed of the fact. It is further the case that men who are beginning, like the writer of the sonnets, to feel tired and old, are apt to feel an increased and special pleasure in the beauty of the young. (Mr. Beeching's illustration of the friendship of the sonnets from the friendship of Gray and Bonstetten is worth pages of argument.) If we remember, in addition, what some critics appear constantly to forget, that Sh. was a particularly poetical being, we shall hardly be surprised that the beginning of this friendship seems to have been something like a falling in love; and, if we must needs praise and blame, we should also remember that it became a "marriage of true minds." And as to the intensity of the feeling expressed in the sonnets, we can easily believe it to be characteristic of the man who made Valentine and Proteus, Brutus and Cassius, Horatio and Hamlet; who painted that strangely moving portrait of Antonio, middle-aged, sad, and almost indifferent between life and death, but devoted to the young, brilliant spendthrift Bassanio; and who portrayed the sudden compelling enchantment exercised by the young Sebastian over the Antonio of *T.N.*

("Shakespeare the Man," *Oxford Lectures on Poetry*, pp. 330–34.)

Ernest Sutherland Bates: No better example of the results to which a loss of the clear sense of literary values may lead could be adduced than the tendency to confound the imaginative value and sincerity of Sh.'s sonnets with that to be found in the work of his contemporaries. The mistake has largely arisen from the old-fashioned tendency to regard the Shakespearean sonnets as a unit, and to assume that what can be said of any of them applies equally well to all. That some of them belong among the most conventional and conceited sonnets of the century has never been doubted, though it may be said that here as often elsewhere Sh. was unconventionally conventional. When he takes up a convention he tends to carry it to its logical extreme as his contemporaries could not do. I doubt if the punning sonnets on his own name (135, 136), or the sonnet treating the theme of his love's being painted on his own heart (24), can quite be equalled for perverse ingenuity among all his contemporaries. So the other conventionalities that he adopts are either unusually intellectualized or unusually emotionalized.

But the whole matter of the conceits in Sh.'s sonnets has recently been emphasized more than it deserves. The following are practically all the important instances: punning, Sonnets 135, 136, 143; the conceit of the portrait of his beloved as painted on his heart, Sonnet 24; personification of eyes and heart, Sonnets 46, 47; play upon the idea of the four elements, Sonnets 44, 45; elaborate legal similes, Sonnets 46, 87, 134; purely Petrarchistic complaints of the lady's cruelty, Sonnets 57, 58, 139, 140, 149; tendency to see his beloved in all the objects of Nature, Sonnets 98, 99, 113, 114; comparison of his beloved to people of the past, Sonnets 59, 106; love-wracked, sleepless nights, Sonnets 27, 28, 43, 61; the eternizing theme, lamentation over the passage of youth and beauty, and consolation in the thought of his beloved's eternity in his own poetry, Sonnets 15, 18, 19, 54, 55, 60, 63, 64, 65, 81, 100, 101, 107. It will be seen that, with the exception of the last, these conceits appear in only 26 out of the total collection of 154 sonnets — surely a small proportion. In regard to the eternizing theme, I should myself have characterized it as a natural although conventional thought rather than as a conceit, but I place it in the list out of deference to Mr. Lee, to whom it is a source of peculiar umbrage. . . . On the whole, the surprising fact in connection with the Shakespearean sonnets is that conventional ideas and conceits are as few as they are. His was the largest Elizabethan collection of love-sonnets; yet no contemporary collection of a quarter the size exists in which there will not be found many more conceits and conventionalities. The eternal tears and sighs of the lover, his despair, his long-continued dying for the sake of the beloved, the elsewhere omnipresent alternate fire and ice of the lover's passion and his fears, the hackneyed classical allusions, these receive no countenance from Sh. He alone was never caught in the net of his lady's hair or imprisoned in her eyes; we have no evidence from him that she was ever sick, or that she lived beside a river; she is not shown to us in similes of jewels or precious stones. One reading Sh.'s sonnets by themselves is likely to be unduly sensitive to the conceits that are to be found there, but one reading them after acquaintance with the work of his contemporaries is continually surprised by the absence of the well-known and expected phraseology. . . .

It had become the universally accepted superstition of the sonneteers, even as of the modern novel, that romantic love is not only the chief blessing of earthly existence, but that it is actually the be-all and end-all. Sadness, sorrow, and even death, appear only as experiences connected with love between the sexes. For the typical Petrarchist to have repined for any other cause than the loss of his mistress would have seemed a kind of sacrilege. In Sh. all this is changed. The misfortunes of life are given their true place as results from many causes. In S. 29 the poet's sorrow arises from his self-doubt, recognition of his "disgrace with fortune and men's eyes," "desire for this man's art and that man's scope"; in S. 30 he beweeps "precious friends hid in death's dateless night"; in S. 66 he contemplates with bitterness the injustice of human life; and in each case the thought of his friend's love comes to him as a consolation. What could be more completely opposed to the usual sonneteering conventions?

To the Petrarchist, however great the real joys with which he is surrounded, love is sufficient to spoil them all and turn them into sentimental sorrow; to Sh., however great the real sorrow, his love is sufficient to mitigate it and bring consolation. Likeness to these three sonnets will be sought in vain among all the other Renaissance sonneteers, excepting again Michelangelo. And if ever poetry carried in its features the indubitable marks of genuine emotion, these three sonnets of Sh., and a dozen others in only a slightly less degree, are among the noblest witnesses of that power in ours or any language. . . .

Sh.'s superiority to his sonneteering predecessors and contemporaries lies therefore not only in his unmatchable technique, but also in the greater truth and depth of his attitude toward life. His sonnets show us feelings that are convincing and intensely human; we have in them a pre-eminent example of imaginative sincerity.

("The Sincerity of Sh.'s Sonnets," *Modern Philology*, 8: 100–06.)

J. W. Mackail: Those who profess to find in the Sonnets a body of metaphysical doctrine; those who extract from them, with as much violence to psychology as to the rules of evidence or to common propriety, a Procopian Secret History of Sh.'s own life; those who argue that they are mere literary exercises on a conventional theme; all at least agree that they are an unequalled masterpiece of imaginative power, of psychological skill and pictorial vision, of mastery in rhythm and phrase. They combine, with a perfection of which Sh. alone had the secret, the most sumptuous richness with the most direct simplicity. Beside them the whole of that mass of Elizabethan sonnet-literature of which they are the crown grows pale, mannered, and thin. Here all is at a higher power; it is poetic quality distilled and concentrated. That this quality is mixed with the conceits and mannerisms of the age is true, as it is true of all Sh.'s work even at its finest, as it is true of *Much Ado* or of *Hamlet*. This must be allowed and even emphasized if we are to keep our feeling for Sh. sane, and on this side idolatry. It is true too that in some of the Sonnets Sh. is sounding on a dim and perilous way; of this he has given, in words which I have already quoted [from S. 121], his own vindication.

The concentration of poetry in the Sonnets is so great, its sweetness so condensed, that we can only appreciate it fully through a sort of process of separation and dilution. . . . "Roses, damask and red," says Bacon in his Essay of Gardens, "are fast flowers of their smells, so that you may walk by a whole row of them and find nothing of their sweetness." They must be approached closely and singly, if their "royal scent" is to produce its full effect. . . . And the only way to appreciate the Sonnets fully is, I think, to know them by heart, to become saturated with them, and then to let passage after passage, phrase after phrase, line after line, expand and germinate as memory recalls it, association touches it, imagination kindles it. Then an enhanced richness, a subtler grace, a more essential beauty will flash upon that inward eye which is the bliss of solitude.

(*Lectures on Poetry*, pp. 206–07.)

THE TEXTS OF 1609 AND 1640

THE Sonnets Quarto was entered on the Stationers' Register on May 20, 1609, in the following terms: "Thomas Thorpe Entred for his copie vnder th [h]andes of master Wilson and master Lownes Warden a Booke called Shakespeares *sonnettes* vj[d]." It was issued, as the Bibliography indicates, with two imprints, that of John Wright and that of William Aspley; the text of both are identical. A single extant copy (now in the Bridgewater Library) contains a trifling variant noted in the textual notes for 78, 6; and the extant copies also differ in the catchword at the bottom of folio F3 *recto*, — circumstances which, as Sir Sidney Lee observes, "illustrate the common practice among Elizabethan printers of binding up an uncorrected sheet, after the sheet has been corrected." (*Sonnets*, 1905, p. 46n.) The text as given in this quarto was reprinted by Lintott in 1709–10, by Steevens in 1766, and by Malone (1780 and 1790) with many corrections. Its authority and accuracy remained practically undiscussed until the 19th century, and even then were considered for the most part only in connection with the question whether Sh. authorized the publication and whether the quarto arrangement of the Sonnets is of significance. It was for this purpose that KNIGHT was led to observe: "The edition of 1609, although, taken as a whole, not very inaccurate, is full of those typographical errors which invariably occur when a manuscript is put into the hands of a printer to deal with it as he pleases, without reference to the author, or to any competent editor, upon any doubtful points. Malone, in a note upon the 77th Sonnet, very truly says, '*This*, *their*, and *thy* are so often confounded in these Sonnets, that it is only by attending to the context that we can discover which was the author's word.' He is speaking of the original edition. It is evident, therefore, that in the progress of the book through the press there was no one capable of deciphering the obscurity of the manuscript by a regard to the context. The manuscript, in all probability, was made up of a copy of copies; so that the printer even was not responsible for those errors which so clearly show the absence of a presiding mind in the conduct of the printing." (*Pictorial Sh.*, 6: 486.) In comparatively recent times the same line of argument was developed by ROLFE, with special emphasis on the printing of S. 126 (see the commentary).

STAUNTON, in connection with his heroic efforts to correct the Sh. text in general, gave attention to the Sonnets, and, when presenting his emendations, remarked: "The Sonnets carry all the appearance of having been put in type from copy much damaged, and in many places illegible. This would be the natural condition of writings which had been copied and re-copied for a dozen years. . . . At the same time, they do not appear to have been sent to press without examination by a qualified person. The metrical arrangement is re-

markably free from error, and it would seem as if the editor had taken some pains to supply the deficiencies of the MS. in other respects. . . . [The misprints] are seldom utterly nonsensical, or absolutely negligible, like the blunders of a stupid or negligent typographer, but the true expression, or what we may suppose to have been so, is superseded by another, more or less resembling it in form." (*Athenæum*, Jan. 3, 1874, p. 20.) DOWDEN gave comparatively little attention to the text; he observes, however, that the quarto, "though not carelessly printed, is far less accurate than *V. & A.*," taking this to be evidence that it had "neither the superintendence nor the consent of the author." (Intro., p. 13.) TYLER'S statement is that "the book is not printed quite so accurately as was possible at the time, but still it is printed fairly well. It is pretty evident that Sh. did not correct successive proofs," but one need not go so far as to think it impossible that he furnished the MS. (Intro., pp. 136–37.)

It was reserved for WYNDHAM, in his edition of the Poems, to undertake the vindication of the quarto text. In particular, he maintains that the printer's use of capitals and italics was much less erratic than has been generally assumed, a matter of some importance for particular passages (see commentary, notes on 1, 2; 20, 7; 125, 13). Capitals, for instance, are used for personal appellations, terms of foreign extraction, titles of dignity, personifications, names of arts and sciences, of animals and plants used emblematically or typically, etc. All this goes to show "that the Quarto was not carelessly issued, and to defeat many conclusions drawn from the opposite assumption." The same thing is true of the punctuation: allowing for stops placed, contrary to modern usage, to mark rhythmical or rhetorical pauses, and for a number of cases of transposition, "the remainder of error to be accounted for by careless editing is by no means abnormal. On the other hand, in many instances the punctuation is so exquisitely adapted to the sense, rhetoric, and rhythm of the phrase as to confirm my plea for the authority of the text." The use of the apostrophe as a guide to the metrical pronunciation, i.e., when a syllable is not to be sounded, gives further support to this claim. "Having considered every case in which a word imports an extra syllable into a line, I can find but two in which the Quarto can be said with any certainty to err," viz., 104, 10–12 and 124, 2–4. On the opposite side may be set the following errors, certain or probable: the repetition in 146, 2; the repetition in 34, 10–12; the want of rhyme in 25, 9–11; the repetition of 36, 13–14 and 96, 13–14; the occasional confusion of "their" with "thy"; the seeming deficiency in S. 126; together with "some half-dozen of trifling misprints." Wyndham's conclusion is that "the number of undoubted corruptions is so small as to be negligible." (Intro., p. 268.)

To this argument BEECHING replies. As to punctuation: in order to maintain Wyndham's thesis "it is not sufficient to show . . . that occasionally the punctuation is admirable; . . . it is necessary also to show that in no, or very few, cases is the punctuation unintelligent or absurd. Such cases, as a matter of fact, are not infrequent." (Cf. 16, 10; 39, 7–8; 55, 7–8; 99, 2–5; 113, 13; 117, 10; 118, 9–10; 126, 7–8.) As to corruptions in the text, and "trifling mis-

prints," Wyndham's list is far too short; cf. 12, 4; 39, 12; 40, 7; 41, 8; 44, 13; 51, 10; 54, 14; 56, 13; 58, 10–11; 65, 12; 69, 3; 73, 4; 76, 7; 91, 9; 99, 9; 102, 8; 106, 12; 108, 3; 113, 6; 127, 9; 129, 9–11; 144, 6. Comparing the texts of *V. & A.* and *Lucrece*, which Sh. saw through the press, we find there but three misprints in each (not reckoning eccentricities of spelling). (Intro., pp. lix–lxiii.) The same position is maintained by LEE, in his careful account of the Quarto text in the introduction to the Clarendon Press facsimile edition (1905). To the list of errors enumerated by Beeching he adds those in 23, 14; 28, 14; 47, 11; 77, 10; 88, 1; 90, 11; 96, 11; 112, 14; 132, 2; 132, 9; 140, 13; 152, 13; 153, 14; besides many instances of unintelligent and unusual spelling. "The substitution, fifteen times, of *their* for *thy* or *thine* [see list in note on 26, 12], and once of *there* for *thee* [31, 8], even more forcibly illustrates the want of intelligent apprehension of the subject-matter of the poems on the part of those who saw the volume through the press. Few works are more dependent for their due comprehension on the correct reproduction of the possessive pronouns, and the frequent recurrence of this form of error is very damaging to the reputation of the text. . . . The like want of care, although of smaller moment, is apparent in the frequent substitution of the preposition *to* for the adverbial *too* (38, 3; 61, 14; 74, 12; 83, 7; 86, 2; the reverse mistake appears in 135, 2). At least thrice *were* is confused with *wear* (77, 1; 98, 11; 140, 5)." There are also a number of errors in the catchwords at the bottom of the page. "Punctuation shows, on the whole, no more systematic care than other features of composition. Commas are frequent, both in and out of place. At times they stand for a full stop. At times they are puzzlingly replaced by a colon or semicolon, or again they are omitted altogether. Brackets are occasionally used as a substitute for commas [cf. 57, 6; 58, 5; 71, 9–10; 80, 11], but not regularly enough to justify a belief that they were introduced on a systematic plan." Both capital letters and italic type "appear rarely and at the compositor's whim." Lee's conclusion is that the text of the quarto fully confirms the belief "that the enterprise lacked authority, and was pursued throughout in that reckless spirit which infected publishing speculations of the day." (Intro., pp. 40–48.)

In his note on the text of the Sonnets as issued in the *Stratford Town Shakespeare* (1907), BULLEN observes: "While I wholly dissent from Mr. Wyndham's view that Sh. authorised and superintended the publication, I cannot agree with Canon Beeching that the 1609 Sonnets is exceptionally ill-printed. Errors there are, but they are generally of trifling import." (10: 448.) He adds that a number of the errors in Lee's list may be regarded as fairly normal variants of spelling.

Beyond these arguments there does not seem to be much prospect of advancing. In general, it may be said with assurance that Wyndham's view of the quarto text has not proved tenable, and that most critics would stand, on the whole, with Beeching and Lee. To this there are two exceptions deserving of notice, though the critics in question have not discussed in detail the evidence under consideration. Mr. PERCY SIMPSON, in his useful book on *Shakespearean Punctuation* (1911), includes the original texts of the Sonnets and

other poems together with matter relating primarily to the First Folio of the plays, — a work published, of course, under very different conditions from the quarto of 1609. The method followed by Simpson is to infer, by induction, a general rule as to the practice of Shakespeare's printers, — such as that the comma may be used to indicate a purely metrical pause, or that it may be omitted after a noun in the vocative, — and to note characteristic examples. There is no question of the utility of his work, especially if we confine ourselves to a single volume, like the Folio, presumably made up under a single group of compositors and correctors; and it may also be admitted without hesitation that he has given a needed warning against the prevalent assumption that Elizabethan printers, in general, distributed marks of punctuation with wholly erratic — and consequently negligible — abandon. Nevertheless, it still remains necessary to prove, for any given piece of printing, that it was carefully composed; and the fallacy in a number of Simpson's inferences is similar to that noted by both Beeching and Lee in the case of Wyndham. We may properly note, in explanation of an otherwise mysterious capital letter, that the printer often used a capital for a personification or for a technological term; but this raises no presumption that he did so with authoritative consistency, provided one finds many such words left *without* capitals. We may explain a comma on the ground that it marks a merely metrical pause, but this has no significance for the value of the punctuation of the text as a whole, if it turns out that this is not done with any degree of regularity. And no such regularity has been shown, by Simpson any more than by Wyndham, for the quarto of 1609. The second notable instance of devotion to the quarto text is Miss PORTER'S "First Folio" edition of the Sonnets. There can be no objection to the publisher's extending the title of this edition to cover the poems, assuming that it was desired to include the whole text of Shakespeare; nor would it be fair to emphasize the fact that the editor carelessly reprints the explanatory notes (p. xxiv) in the same form in which they appear for the plays, beginning with the statement that the text is that of the "First Folio, 1623." These details, however, are more or less significant of the fact that Miss Porter carries over her reverence for the Folio text, apparently without pausing for inquiry or reasoning, to that of the Sonnets quarto. Her only statement regarding the authority of the latter is that "the poet had nothing to do with the publication" (with proof, borrowed without acknowledgment from Rolfe, based on S. 126); but she commonly treats the eccentric printings of the edition as of almost mystical importance, — with what results many of the notes cited in the commentary sufficiently indicate. On the other hand, students of the Sonnets are grateful for the careful reprint of the original text to which this devotion gave rise.

There remains a single additional matter which may be noted in connection with the quarto of 1609. VON MAUNTZ is the only editor of the Sonnets who has found any significance in the head-pieces which appear on the title-page and the first page of the text. He assumes, apparently, that they were made for the particular volume, and is disposed to connect the design of the three inverted

fishes on the title-page with the three gold fishes in the arms of the Lucy family; this, with the hares and other animal figures, may involve an allusion to the traditional poaching episode of Sh.'s youth. The design on the page containing the first sonnets is more difficult to interpret; but Von Mauntz is tempted to discern a pair of woodcocks on either side, and the amputated leg of a fowl (with three claws) at the right of the lower center; the inference is that there may be a satiric allusion to the poet's defeated hopes. (*Gedichte von W. Sh.*, p. 153.) It is only just to add that Von Mauntz himself marks this conjecture with both an exclamation point and a mark of interrogation. Having asked the opinion of Mr. Alfred W. Pollard on this matter of the head-pieces, I find that he confirms the natural supposition that they are stock-designs, in no way to be associated with the particular volume in question. "I have only been able," Mr. Pollard writes, "to look up ten volumes printed by Eld before 1609. In three of these I have found an earlier version of the three-fishes headpiece, in which the centre agrees, but the amoretti are leaning back instead of forwards. . . . The other design, which the Baconians usually interpret as two A's, is one of the commonest of headpieces, and there are many variations of it."

The first collected edition of Sh.'s Poems appeared in 1640, with the imprint of John Benson (see the Bibliography for full title, etc.; and for the arrangement of the Sonnets as found in it, see p. 434). Benson's address "To the Reader" is as follows: "I here presume (under favour) to present to your view, some excellent and sweetely composed Poems, of Master William Shakespeare, Which in themselves appeare of the same purity, the Authour himselfe then living avouched; they had not the fortune by reason of their Infancie in his death, to have the due accomodation of proportionable glory, with the rest of his everliving Workes, yet the lines of themselves will afford you a more authentick approbation than my assurance any way can, to invite your allowance, in your perusall you shall finde them Seren, cleere and eligantly plaine, such gentle straines as shall recreate and not perplexe your braine, no intricate or cloudy stuffe to puzzell intellect, but perfect eloquence, such as will raise your admiration to his praise: this assurance I know will not differ from your acknowledgement. And certaine I am, my opinion will be seconded by the sufficiency of these ensuing Lines; I have been somewhat solicitus to bring this forth to the perfect view of all men; and in so doing, glad to be serviceable for the continuance of glory to the deserved Author in these his Poems."

Lee comments on this volume as follows: "The volume came from the press of Thomas Cotes, the printer who was at the moment the most experienced of any in the trade in the production of Shakespearean literature. Cotes had bought in 1627 and 1630 the large interests in Sh.'s plays which had belonged respectively to Isaac Jaggard and Thomas Pavier. He printed the Second Folio of 1632 and a new edition of *Pericles* in 1635. . . . But, closely associated as the Poems of 1640 were, through the printer Cotes, with the current reissues of Sh.'s works, it may be doubted whether Benson depended on Thorpe's printed volume in his confused impression of the sonnets. The

word 'sonnets,' which loomed so large in Thorpe's edition, finds no place in Benson's. In the title-pages, in the head-lines, and in the publisher's 'Advertisement,' Benson calls the contents 'poems' or 'lines.' He avows no knowledge of 'Shakespeares Sonnets.' Thorpe's dedication to Mr. W. H. is ignored. The order in which Thorpe printed the sonnets is disregarded. . . . The variations from Thorpe's text, though not for the most part of great importance, are numerous. . . . Benson's text seems based on some amateur collection of pieces of manuscript poetry, which had been in private circulation. His preface implies that the sonnets and poems in his collection were not among those which he knew Sh. to have 'avouched' (i.e. publicly acknowledged) in his lifetime. By way of explaining their long submergence, he hazards a guess that they were penned very late in the dramatist's life. John Warren, who contributes new commendatory lines ('Of Mr. William Shakespear') for Benson's edition, writes of the sonnets as if the reader was about to make their acquaintance for the first time. He says of them that they

> Will make the learned still admire to see
> The Muses' gifts so fully infused on thee.

The theory that the publisher Benson sought his copy elsewhere than in Thorpe's treasury is supported by other considerations. Sonnets 138 and 144, which take the 31st and 32nd places respectively in Benson's volume, ignore Thorpe's text, and follow that of Jaggard's *Passionate Pilgrim* (1599 or 1612). The omission of eight sonnets tells the same tale. . . . It is difficult to account for [their exclusion] except on the assumption that Benson's compiler had not discovered them." (*Sonnets*, 1905, pp. 55–58.)

These arguments of Lee are in themselves plausible, but a comparison of the exact texts of Benson's volume and Thorpe's quarto soon showed me that the former was unquestionably printed from the latter. For the detailed evidence, see my article in *Modern Philology*, vol. 14 (May, 1916). This may be summarized by the statement that, despite many differences, the general effect is that of a fairly close following, in the details of spelling, punctuation, and typography, of the text of 1609. In the case of italicized words — the item least likely to be dependent on MS. copy — there is not a single instance of divergence; in the matters of capitalization, punctuation, and spelling, differences are not infrequent, but are far too few to be accounted for by an independent copy. As to the printing of Sonnets 138 and 144 from the text of the *Passionate Pilgrim*, they were the first poems in that collection, and so the first to be chosen for reprinting in Benson's volume; the contents of the *Pilgrim* volume were, in general, inserted in their original order. As to the remarks in Benson's Preface, they must be regarded as deliberately intended to deceive; the book was made by reprinting the contents of three or four volumes issued some thirty years before, but purchasers were to be led to think that the material in it was new. The only piece of evidence offered by Lee in proof of the view that the volume of 1640 was not based on that of 1609, which presents any difficulty, is that concerning the eight omitted sonnets. Of this circum-

stance I know no wholly satisfactory explanation, though I have made some suggestions regarding it in the article cited above. The upshot of all this is that the text of 1640 is without independent interest or authority. It corrects errors of the quarto in something like twenty passages, and makes new errors in about fifty more; all these, of course, are duly indicated in the textual notes.

THE ARRANGEMENT OF THE SONNETS

THE volume of *Poems* of 1640 (see page 434) contains no discussion or explanation of the order of the Sonnets as there reprinted, nor did the contrasting arrangements of that collection and the Quarto of 1609 attract special attention in the 18th century. KNIGHT, in the *Pictorial Sh.* (1843), seems to have been the first modern critic to propose a new arrangement, though he prints the sonnets in the original order. "Believing as we do," he said, "that 'W. H.,' be he who he may, who put these poems in the hands of 'T. T.,' the publisher, arranged them in the most arbitrary manner (of which there are many proofs), we believe that the assumption of continuity, however ingeniously it may be maintained, is altogether fallacious. . . . It is our intention, without at all presuming to think that we have discovered any real order in which these extraordinary productions may be arranged, to offer them to the reader upon a principle of classification, which, on the one hand, does not attempt to reject the idea that a continuous poem, or rather several continuous poems, may be traced throughout the series, nor adopt the belief that the whole can be broken up into fragments; but which, on the other hand, does no violence to the meaning of the author by a pertinacious adherence to a principle of continuity, sometimes obvious enough." (6: 455–56.) Again: "The transpositions we have made in the arrangement are justified by the consideration that in the original text the 50th, 51st, and 52nd Sonnets are entirely isolated; that the 27th and 28th are also perfectly unconnected with what precedes and what follows; that the 61st stands equally alone; and that the 43rd, 44th, and 45th are in a similar position." (p. 465.) Both Knight's argument and his arrangement were approved, on the whole, by HUDSON, in his edition of 1856. In the following year, 1857, FRANÇOIS VICTOR HUGO presented his translation in a new arrangement of his own. In 1859 CARTWRIGHT issued his rearrangement, and in 1862 BODENSTEDT his — translated into German. Meantime DELIUS, following the original order in his text, had stated that that order was the result of mere chance, "for if now and then sonnets treating the same theme with variations are placed together, on the other hand sonnets which obviously belong together, or strike the same note, are separated from one another in Thorpe's edition, and a systematically maintained plan — according to either content or chronology — can nowhere be recognized." (*Works*, 2d ed., 7: 114.) It may, then, have been Delius who made the rearrangement which appeared in a German edition of 1864 (see Bibliography under that date), in the same year with his revised (second) edition of the standard text. GRANT WHITE, in his edition of 1865, asserted that except in Sonnets 1–17 no continuity could be discovered. In 1866 MASSEY issued his commentary, including an arrangement based on his new theory of the Sonnets, and hence incommensurable with any other. In

1879 BURGERSDIJK, translating the Sonnets into Dutch, revised Bodenstedt's order. In 1881 STENGEL discussed (*Englische Studien*, 4: 1) the problem of arrangement, and presented a new order in which he thought the poet's intention might be discerned. In the same year appeared DOWDEN'S well made edition, with a thorough-going defence of the Quarto arrangement, and a series of notes designed to show the well-nigh perfect continuity of the Sonnets, read in that order. It was perhaps owing to this strengthening of the conservative position that the problem of arrangement had rest for more than a decade.

In 1892 SHINDLER contributed to the *Gentleman's Magazine* (272: 70) the most cogent attack upon the Quarto order that had yet been made, and showed that to take this position did not imply the ability to reconstruct the original order of composition; on the contrary, he held that the theory of one or more connected series of sonnets must be abandoned, "and each sonnet left to tell its own story." His argument, severely condensed, is as follows. There is abundant evidence that the Quarto was not published under Sh.'s authority or direction. If it is a piratical publication, it is possible that it includes a number of sonnets not Sh.'s, and highly probable that it does not by any means include all the sonnets he wrote; he wrote sonnets, as Meres's remark about "his private friends" would indicate, to many persons, and Thorpe published whatever he could lay hands on, without reference to the person addressed. The disorder of the Quarto "is not absolute chaos; there are signs of continuity, there are numbers which clearly stand together, but the breaks and gaps, the omissions and the wrong arrangements, are just as clear. . . . Thorpe, left without any help from the author, could only print the Sonnets just as they stood in his MS. Those that, either in books or on sheets of paper, stood together, he printed together, and so produced those traces of orderly arrangement which we see." On the other hand, there are many evidences of displacement. "The confusion of Sonnets 33–35 and 40–42 with 69–70 ought to be enough of itself to show that the hypothesis of a single series chronologically arranged is altogether untenable." "39 probably, and certainly 26 and 27, belong to the series of Absence Sonnets, which begins with 43 and concludes with 52, and the right position of the two latter is probably after 51. And this sequence, from 43 to 52, is rudely interrupted by 49, which is manifestly out of place." In the Rival Poet group (76–86) 77 and 81 are intrusions. In the sonnets after 126 "the traces of order are fewer and we have almost utter chaos." All this should discourage dogmatism. "The same cause which makes the arrangement wrong will prevent us from ever putting it right."

LEE'S *Life of Sh.* (1898) restated the argument against the order of the Q. "Fantastic endeavours have been made to detect in the original arrangement a closely connected narrative, but the thread is on any showing constantly interrupted. . . . The choice and succession of topics in each 'group' give to neither genuine cohesion. . . . In tone and subject-matter numerous sonnets in the second as in the first 'group' lack visible sign of coherence with those they immediately precede or follow. . . . There remains the historic fact that readers

and publishers of the 17th century acknowledged no sort of significance in the order in which the poems first saw the light. When the sonnets were printed for a second time in 1640 — 31 years after their first appearance — they were presented in a completely different order." (pp. 96–100.)

Undeterred by this agnosticism, reconstructed arrangements of the Sonnets soon began to reappear. VON MAUNTZ's German translation of 1894 presented one; BUTLER's edition of 1899 another; GODWIN's discussion of 1900 a third. (Butler's rearrangement, however, involves comparatively few changes, and he defended the Quarto order, on the whole, as the only possible one for the presentation of a coherent story.) ACHESON, in his work on *Sh. and the Rival Poet* (1903), attacked the Quarto arrangement on partially new grounds, and began a reconstruction, based on a theory of disarranged sequences of 20 sonnets each, which he has not yet completed — or at any rate made public. Mrs. STOPES, in her edition of 1904, proposed a rearrangement which she did not profess to find authoritative, but believed to be nearer the true order than the original. Meantime ROLFE, in successive revisions of his edition, became increasingly emphatic in distrusting the Quarto order; see his note on Sonnet 70, in the commentary, for the impossibility of reading it consistently, in the given order, with 33–35 and 40–42. "One broken link," he adds, "spoils the chain; if the order of the poems is wrong here, it may be so elsewhere."

The most important recent editorial discussion and rearrangement is that of WALSH, in his edition of 1908. "Thorpe's arrangement of the sonnets," he says, "is as poor as could be expected of a purloiner who published stolen goods without a title, without a preface, without a note, but with innumerable misprints and with two misstatements in the little information he did vouchsafe to give. We need not hesitate to pronounce it worthless. It is neither chronological nor according to subjects. It opens with the longest of the possible groups of sonnets, and so at the start conveys the impression of orderliness — a clever trick, which has deceived most of the subsequent editors. . . . But after this group there is a breaking up and a scattering. Occasionally two or three sonnets which obviously treat of the same subject and of which one is a direct continuation of another are brought into juxtaposition; but these can be matched by others that plainly belong together and are placed apart. Almost all editors have complained of the inappropriate position of some particular sonnets. It is strange they do not admit unauthoritativeness in the entire sequence. Yet nothing can be plainer than that Thorpe's arrangement of the sonnets is of no more help to our understanding of their development than is the Folio-editors' arrangement of the plays." (Intro., pp. 31–32.) With this as a starting-point, Walsh rearranges them, not with reference to some attempted reconstruction of a continuous story, but on the basis of the usual stylistic evidence of chronology and the natural grouping suggested by subject-matter. Professor H. D. GRAY (*Publ. M. L. A.*, n.s., 23: 635n.) comments to this effect: "Mr. Walsh considers each sonnet as a law unto itself, and he breaks up the obvious sequences rather needlessly. Still, one who came to the Sonnets for the first time in his edition would, I think, gain a truer impression

of their meaning and value than he would from the Quarto arrangement." In this opinion the present editor concurs. GRAY, in the article just cited, sums up the question thus: "In the face of such facts as we have, it seems odd that the arrangement of the Sonnets in the Quarto of 1609 should ever have been taken as of any authority whatever. The Sonnets were presumably written at intervals during several years and given out in small groups or singly; they were copied and recopied; we know from the *Passionate Pilgrim*, as well as from a preserved MS. of S. 8, that there existed various differing copies; it is conceded by all that Sh. did not supervise nor authorize Thorpe's Quarto (note both the errors and the dedication by the publisher); no one denies that Thorpe took *some* liberties with the arrangement, since he removed to the end those Sonnets that did not apply to the youth; we find in the first series . . . innocence attributed to the young man after guilt has been recorded; we find sequences interrupted by sonnets which have nothing to do with the sonnets about them. There can be no real possibility, therefore, that Thorpe's collection of manuscripts could have been supplied in their proper order either by the author or by the person to whom so many of them were addressed." (p. 630.) After examining certain peculiarities of the text (such as the use of "thou" and "you," the misprint of "their" for "thy," and the use of italics), Gray draws the conclusion "that various MSS. of sonnet groups came into Thorpe's hands, some of the MSS. bearing characteristics not found in the others, and that Thorpe seems not to have disturbed his MS. groups more than was necessary to remove duplicates and to put at the end sonnets which *could* not be read as concerned with Mr. W. H. Indeed, the very fact that every sonnet which *can* be read as addressed to the youth is placed in the first series, and that no other sonnet, though dealing with the same theme, is to be found there, is evidence of just such an obvious sorting out as Thorpe could and would be responsible for." (p. 634.)

Turning now to the argument in behalf of the arrangement of 1609, we may consider CHARLES ARMITAGE BROWN to be the first name of note, since, in his volume of 1838, he laid much stress on a grouping of the Sonnets designed to make the continuity of the standard text intelligible. On the whole, this grouping may be said still to represent the orthodox view of the sonnet story. It is as follows:

First Poem. — 1–26. To his friend, persuading him to marry.

Second Poem. — 27–55. To his friend — who had robbed the poet of his mistress — forgiving him.

Third Poem. — 56–77. To his friend, complaining of his coldness, and warning him of life's decay.

Fourth Poem. — 78–101. To his friend, complaining that he prefers another poet's praises, and reproving him for faults that may injure his character.

Fifth Poem. — 102–126. To his friend, excusing himself for having been some time silent, and disclaiming the charge of inconstancy.

Sixth Poem. — 127–152. To his mistress, on her infidelity.

Brown, however, admitted some disorder in the "sixth poem." FURNIVALL,

in his introduction to the *Leopold Sh.* (1877), presented another and more detailed outline of the Sonnets, dividing the First Group (1–126) into fifteen sections, and the Second Group into eleven; but this outline rather emphasizes than relieves the difficulty of finding continuity in such an analysis. In the following year T. A. SPALDING, in an article in the *Gentleman's Magazine*, made a rather more consistent analysis, dividing Sonnets 1–126 into three groups and a number of smaller sections, interpreted as developing an intelligible story.

DOWDEN, as has already appeared, made a new defence and interpretation of the Quarto arrangement, in his edition of 1881. "That the Sonnets are not printed in the Quarto, 1609, at haphazard," he said, "is evident from the fact that the *envoy* (126) is rightly placed; that poems addressed to a mistress follow those addressed to a friend; and that the two Cupid and Dian sonnets stand together at the close. A nearer view makes it apparent that in the first series, 1–126, a continuous story is conducted through various stages to its termination; a more minute inspection discovers points of contact or connection between sonnet and sonnet, and a natural sequence of thought, passion, and imagery." (Intro., p. 24.) He admits, however, that this does not apply to the series 127–154. The Quarto order seems also to be confirmed, he argues, by certain aspects of the puzzling variation in the use of the pronouns "thou" and "you": "in the first 50 sonnets 'you' is of extremely rare occurrence; in the second 50 'you' and 'thou' alternate in little groups of sonnets, 'thou' having still a preponderance, but now only a slight preponderance; in the remaining 26 'you' becomes the ordinary mode of address, and 'thou' the exception." (p. 25.) This argument, we may note at once, is answered by BEECHING, himself a believer in the Quarto order: "How little dependence can be placed on such an argument is shown by the fact that in the sonnets about the Rival Poet, which undoubtedly form a series, sometimes 'thou' is used and sometimes 'you.' And in face of the fact that 97 and 98, which are almost identical in sense, employ different pronouns, it is impossible to discriminate between them." (Intro., p. lxv n.)

Since Dowden's time there has been no thorough-going defence of the Quarto arrangement, but its authority has been assumed, and sometimes explicitly sanctioned, by a number of editors and critics. TYLER, in his introduction to the Praetorius Facsimile (1886), observed that "it has been assumed that the order given in the First Quarto is the right order; and this must certainly be maintained until the contrary has been proved" (p. xxvi); and he took the liberty of adding on the margins of the facsimile text the captions "Series I," "Series II," and "Series III," opposite Sonnets 1, 127, and 153 respectively.* GOLLANCZ, in the *Temple Sh.* (1896), went further than almost any other commentator: "If it could be proved," he said, "that any one sonnet is out of

* A liberty that has lately resulted in one of the most amusing phenomena in the whole mass of sonnet criticism. Clara de Chambrun, in her work on the Sonnets (1913), makes the amazing statement that in the Thorpe edition the poems are "divided into three separate series by a note in the margin," a division which she very truly adds "has never been referred to by any commentator." (p. 15.) In confirmation she reproduces what is called "a facsimile of page 57 of the Thorpe edition," but is really a photograph of the Praetorius facsimile, including one of Tyler's captions in modern lettering on the margin!

place, the whole chain would perhaps be spoilt, but no such 'broken link' can be adduced." (Intro., p. vi.) WYNDHAM, in his edition of the Poems (1898), also represents an extreme position, since he believed that the Quarto of 1609 is a more authoritative publication than has been generally supposed: "Whether or not [the Sonnets] were edited by Sh., [they] must so far have commanded his approval as to arouse no protest against the form in which they appeared. It would have been as easy for him so to re-shuffle and re-publish as it is impossible to believe that he could re-shuffle, and re-publish, and no record of his action survive." Wyndham also went so far as to say that all critics "not quixotically compelled to reject a reasonable view are agreed that the order in the First Series can scarce be bettered." (Intro., p. cix.) HERFORD, in the *Eversley Sh.* (1900), took similar ground. "Displacement may be here and there suspected; but on the whole [the sonnet groups] form a connected sequence, passing by delicate gradations through a rich compass of emotion." (10: 374.) BEECHING, in his edition of 1904, followed to the same effect: "Most modern critics are agreed that at least the first division of the Sonnets is approximately in the order intended by the poet" (Intro., p. lxiii); on the other hand, "it may very well be the case that some few are misplaced," such as 36–39, 75, 77, 81, 97–99 (p. lxv). Beeching adds two arguments wholly or partly new: the fact "that some of the sonnets in the appendix throw light on those addressed to the friend, confirms the theory that the sonnets form a sequence and are not a mere bookseller's haphazard collection" (p. lxiv); and "some further confirmation is afforded by the fact that a printer's error of 'their' for 'thy' occurs 14 times in the series of sonnets from 26 to 70 inclusive, and only once besides, viz. in 128. (This last instance forbids us to explain it by a mere change of compositors.) S. 26 appears to open a new division, and 71 certainly opens another. It looks, therefore, as if the printer has used for this division of the sonnets a separate MS., less plainly written than those he had before him for the rest, and so it becomes almost certain that — at any rate for this section — the order of the sonnets was fixed when it came into Thorpe's hands. S. 128 may very well have been in the same MS." (p. lxv). The present editor has elsewhere commented on this last argument as follows: "Admitting the utmost which these facts can imply, viz., that the misreadings indicate that the MS. of the sonnets in question was in a different handwriting from later ones, we can apply the argument only to the 21 sonnets from 26 to 46 [the errors occurring in 26, 27, 35, 37, 43, 45, 46]; and the recurrence of the error in 69 and 70, after an interval without it, suggests that we may have come back to the same MS., and that consecutiveness has been lost!" (*Kittredge Anniversary Volume*, 1913, pp. 286–87.)

MACKAIL, in his lecture on the Sonnets (*Lectures on Poetry*, 1911), observes: "I see no reason to doubt that they were arranged by Sh., or at all events that they left his hands, in their present order, and that this order is substantially the order of their composition. But this belief is subject to two reservations: in the first place, those sonnets which constitute a consecutive group may have been arranged by him in an order different from that of the dates of their writ-

ing; in the second place, he may have been working on more than one of those groups contemporaneously. As the Sonnets extend over a period of several years, and as different groups of them were clearly sent to their recipient at different times, it was obviously possible either for him, or for some third person into whose hands they had come before they went to the printer, to alter the arrangement; but there is no proof, and no probability, that this was in fact done." (pp. 203–04.) Finally, a partial defender of the Quarto arrangement is found in BRANDL, who, in his introduction to Fulda's translation of the Sonnets (1913), argues: "The traditional order deserves a serious attempt to find it intelligible; if it can be maintained, it has — in comparison with all free attempted arrangements — the authority of the publisher, whose interest must lie not in making an error but in avoiding it. Nor need this arrangement display the complete development of its formation in all details; it may be a later redaction by the author. . . . Finally, it is to be queried whether Francis Meres would have openly praised the friendship sonnets, if they had existed only singly and in unintelligible confusion, and not in self-explanatory grouping — in a MS. collection arranged for a wider circle of friends." (p. xv.) This argument especially concerns what Brandl finds to be the chief series of "friendship sonnets," 18–74; on the other hand, he finds the "political sonnets" to be out of chronological order, those of 1603 preceding at a long interval those of 1601. (p. xxii.)

Mention has already been made of an article on this subject by the present editor, in the *Kittredge Anniversary Volume* (1913). What follows is substantially a reproduction of a portion of that article, having chief concern with the burden of proof in the argument on the Quarto arrangement. (See also, with reference to Dowden's argument from the so-called "envoy," the notes to S. 126.)

If we should approach the sonnets without knowledge of their content, as if discovering them for the first time, our first inquiry would naturally be whether the collection appears on the face of it to be one of the "sequences" so familiar in the Elizabethan age. Of this type of collection the leading traits are well understood. A series of sonnets is addressed to a lady of great beauty, to whom a fanciful name is given (Stella, Diana, Idea, or the like), which commonly forms the title of the whole. This lady is usually cold of heart, and the sequence of poems represents the successive efforts of the writer, her lover, to win her to yield to his passion. Turning to the Sh. Quarto, we find that the title-page bears no conventional title; no lady's name gives it a name; no lady's name is mentioned within it. The book is called simply "Sh.'s Sonnets: never before imprinted." It is not, we may say tentatively, a conventional sequence. A second approach will naturally be the inquiry whether the volume appears to have been published by the author's authority or under his supervision. The discussion of this would be an important matter, were the facts not all but universally admitted. The Quarto is dedicated not by the author but by the publisher, a well-known pirate in his trade; it contains numerous unintelligent misprints; whereas the two poems which Sh. is known to have

published contain dedications from his hand and seem to have been carefully proof-read. These are the chief (but not the only) considerations which have led critics to agree on the surreptitious character of the Quarto of 1609.

In 1640 appeared a new issue of the Sonnets, now printed in an entirely different order, and grouped by the editor with sub-titles as the text suggested. In this edition, of course, there is nothing authoritative; the only significance to be found in its character is negative — to the effect that there was no tradition implying a continuous or two-part text as of 1609.

It is clear, then, so far as this preliminary evidence goes, that the burden of proof is on any attempt to call these sonnets a sequence in the usual meaning of the term. If the character of the contents, examined in detail, indicates a consecutive and significant order, then just to that extent we may regard the arrangement of the Quarto as important; but we have no warrant for beginning to read the collection with the assumption that it is to be interpreted as one interprets a series of poems, much less chapters of a story, set forth by the author in predetermined form. On the contrary, in the absence of further and conflicting evidence, we should expect to find that we have before us a collection of all the sonnets written by Sh., so far as the publisher was able to get hold of them; — an expectation strengthened by the fact that two of the sonnets in the volume, 138 and 144, had been published ten years earlier in another pirated collection, *The Passionate Pilgrim*.

But while the sonnets do not appear to be a sequence of the usual sort, they may give evidence of being an unconventional sequence; that is, they may form a series, either from having been written in the present order or from having been carefully arranged. This, if true, is not to be assumed but proved. Our next task should be, therefore, to read the collection through with a view to asking, not how far it would be possible to conceive the sonnets to be significantly consecutive if we knew that they had been put in this order by the writer, but how far they imply such consecutiveness when we know nothing of the circumstances of their arrangement. Here, of course, there is room for great diversity of judgment. All that can be done here is to set down the results of such a reading as has just been described, in the attitude of one who does not disbelieve in the existence of a large amount of continuity, but who requires to see evidence of it in the text. From this standpoint, apparently connected sonnets, forming — through contiguity — natural groups, may be observed as follows: 1–17; 18–19; 26–28; 33–35; 40–42; 43–45; 46–47; 50–52; 54–55; 56–58; 63–65; 66–68; 69–70; 71–74; 78–80; 82–86; 87–93; 94–96; 97–99; 100–103; 109–112; 117–120; 123–125; 131–132; 133–134; 135–136; 137–138; 139–140; 141–142; 143–144; 147–152; 153–154. It will be understood that this list includes only those sonnets whose text seems to imply some immediate connection with their immediate neighbors; the omitted sonnets being those which, in the absence of any theory of sequence, may naturally be read as independent compositions, together with some which are most naturally associated with others not standing in contiguity with them. No two readers would be likely to reach identical results in pursuing such an attempt as this; but there has been

no effort to make the list as presented err on the side of discontinuity (for example, the continuity of 147–152 is by no means certain). What is the general impression resulting? One considerable series has appeared; — and it is proper to add that another might be admitted as plausible, formed by connecting all the sonnets from 109 to 125. Three short series appear to number respectively five, six, and seven sonnets; there are three groups of four each; there are twelve sonnet trios, and twelve pairs. To an unbiased reader the result would seem to be in accord with the hypothesis already suggested by the more external evidence, viz., that the publisher of this collection gathered all of Sh.'s sonnets that he could obtain, in various MSS. — some arranged, some unarranged, — and made an attempt to set them in order. He placed at the beginning of the book the longest obvious series, or, possibly, the series which he knew had been addressed to the person to whom he wished to dedicate the volume. In other cases his MS. furnished him with pairs and trios which he preserved intact; in still other cases he may have made a pair or a trio of sonnets which appeared to be similar in theme or tone. Finally, observing that the sonnets plainly addressed to women were in the minority, he reserved them for the end of the collection, together with certain other poems on independent topics.

It may be objected that the want of a clearly continuous thread of thought does not prove the collection to be inconsecutive; can one trace such continuity in any Elizabethan sequence? Probably not. But the point in the present case is that the burden of proof is on those seeking to view this collection as a sequence. Moreover, a more detailed survey of the contents would reveal not merely a want of continuity but no little evidence of discontinuity. Dowden describes an Elizabethan sequence as "a chain or series of poems, in a designed or natural sequence, viewing in various aspects a single theme, or carrying on a love-story to its issue, prosperous or the reverse." (Intro., p. 26.) Would any one examining these sonnets of Sh.'s without a predetermined theory be led to find them within the scope of this definition?

Another objection to this agnostic position may be stated as follows: admitting that the series is not a sequence in the usual sense, this does not prevent us from regarding the sonnets as standing, on the whole, in the order of Sh.'s MS. But does this mean the order of Sh.'s original MS., — that is, the order of composition — or that of some final MS. in which he arranged his sonnets? The first alternative no one supposes to be applicable to the whole collection, for about the only certain inference to be drawn from the text is that some of the poems in the "second series" were written at the same time as some in the "first series." The most that is claimed, then, is that sonnets 1–125 are in the original order, — preserved, perhaps, among the papers of the person to whom they are supposed to have been addressed. This view cannot be shown to be impossible; but it remains "not proven." And since some misplacements are admitted by nearly all critics, how can a limit be set? If the MSS. of "W. H." were once disarranged, by a wanton breeze or a careless servant, what may not have happened? The only answer is, that we must fall back on the text as it stands. As to the second alternative, that the existing

order represents Sh.'s wishes at the time the sonnets were collected, we have already seen what the probabilities are that he made any copy for the purpose of publication, and it is a pure assumption that he brought his sonnets into one MS. for any purpose whatever. But even if he did, the argument from disarrangement still applies.

Another possible objection (and here I pass from the matter previously published) may be drawn from the fact that there is no sonnet certainly addressed to a woman in the whole "series" 1–126, and that this could hardly be the case if the order were purely haphazard. This is doubtless a real hindrance to the theory of a purely accidental arrangement — if any one holds such a theory; and it might, not unreasonably, be viewed as implying that Thorpe obtained the great part of the MS. or MSS. containing Sonnets 1–126 from a single source, or from sources such as led him to think that they dealt with identical persons or themes. On the other hand, it will be noted that Professor Gray, in the argument cited above, regards this very circumstance as evidence of Thorpe's desire to attach all the sonnets to "W. H." unless their content absolutely forced him to relegate them to an appendix.

In conclusion, it cannot be too strongly emphasized that to find a connected story in the Sonnets is not to have proved anything regarding their order. Even if only one story could thus be made, it would remain purely hypothetical *unless* the order of the poems were ascertained on unquestionable grounds.* The history of criticism is full of the wrecks of theories dependent on the notion that an individual interpretation was the only possible one. In the case of the Sonnets we have more than a dozen rearrangements, each one telling the true story to its maker. The very existence of these is made a reproach to agnosticism on the subject, just as the multiplication of sects is made a reproach to Protestantism. "You reject the existing order," it is said, "but cannot make a better, which will find general acceptance." But this in itself, of course, is absolutely without pertinence to the question whether the traditional order rests on an adequate basis. The only safety is in definite and substantial reasons for believing that it represents the work of the author. And no such reasons have been found.

There follow outlines of various rearrangements of the Sonnets which have been made or proposed.

* Sir Sidney Lee has truly observed that "if the critical ingenuity which has detected a continuous thread of narration in the order that Thorpe printed Sh.'s Sonnets were applied to the booksellers' miscellany of sonnets called *Diana*, that volume . . . could be made to reveal the sequence of an individual lover's moods quite as readily." (*Life*, p. 94n.) To which Herford (*Eversley Sh.*, 10: 374n.) replies: "He may be invited to try." For myself, as I have said elsewhere (not in frivolity, but with a serious view to the analogy with much work which has been done on the Sonnets), I should dislike to make the experiment with the monotonous pages of the *Diana;* but if only Wordsworth's minor poems, including his sonnets, had come down to us without date, author's title, or note, in an order perhaps determined by the convenience of the publisher, I should undertake to read them in a plausible sequence, and even to show that that sequence went far toward solving the one mystery of the poet's life — the personality of "Lucy." I should trace her among the lakes, along the River Duddon, and the vicinity of Tintern Abbey, show why she was instrumental in preventing the poet from visiting Yarrow, indicate the in-

POEMS OF 1640*

67–69 (The glory of beautie).
60; 63–66 (Injurious Time).
53–54 (True Admiration).
57–58 (The force of love).
59 (The beautie of Nature).
1–3 (Loves crueltie).
13–15 (Youthfull glory).
16–17 (Good Admonition).
7 (Quicke prevention).
4–6 (Magazine of beautie).
8–12 (An invitation to Marriage).
138 (False beleefe). [*Pass. Pilg.* version.]
144 (A Temptation). [*Pass. Pilg.* version.]
*
21 (True content).
23 (A bashfull Lover).
22 (Strong conceite).
* *
20 (The Exchange).
27–29 (A disconsolation).
* *
30–32 (The benefit of Friendship).
* *
38–40 (A congratulation).
41–42 (Losse and gaine).
* * *
44–45 (Melancholy thoughts).
*
33–35 (Loves Releefe).
36–37 (Unanimitie).
*
24 (A Master-peece).
25 (Happinesse in content).
26 (A dutifull Message).
50–51 (Goe and come quickly).
46–47 (Two faithfull friends).
48 (Carelesse neglect).
49 (Stoute resolution).
* * * *

fluence on him of her views on the Visitation of the Sick, Old Abbeys, and the Emigrant French Clergy, and probably demonstrate that she was a daughter of the Leech-Gatherer and a niece of Simon Lee.

* The occasional asterisks indicate other poems introduced from *The Passionate Pilgrim* or elsewhere, the number of asterisks corresponding with the number of such pieces.

62 (Sat fuisse).
55 (A living monument).
52 (Familiaritie breeds contempt).
61 (Patiens Armatus).
71–72; 74 (A Valediction).
70 (Nil magnis Invidia).
80–81 (Love-sicke).
116 (The Picture of true love).
82–85 (In prayse of his Love).
86–87 (A Resignation).
*
88–91 (A request to his scornefull Love).
92–95 (A Lovers affection though his Love prove unconstant).
97–99 (Complaint for his Loves absence).
100–101 (An invocation to his Muse).
104–106 (Constant affection).
102–103 (Amazement).
109–110 (A Lovers excuse for his long absence).
111–112 (A complaint).
113–115 (Selfe flattery of her beautie).
117–119 (Tryall of loves constancy).
120 (A good construction of his Loves unkindenesse).
121 (Errour in opinion).
122 (Upon the receit of a Table Booke from his Mistris).
123 (A Vow).
124 (Loves safetie).
125 (An intreatie for her acceptance).
128 (Upon her playing on the Virginalls).
129 (Immoderate Lust).
127; 130–132 (In prayse of her beautie though black).
133–134 (Unkinde Abuse).
135–136 (A Love-Suite).
137; 139–140 (His heart wounded by her eye).
141–142 (A Protestation).
143 (An Allusion).
145 (Life and death).
146 (A Consideration of death).
147 (Immoderate Passion).
148–150 (Loves powerfull subtilty).
78–79 (Retaliation).
73; 77 (Sunne Set).
107–108 (A monument to Fame).
151–152 (Perjurie).
*
153–154 (Cupids Treacherie).

Knight (1843)

Group I. 135–136; 143; 127; 131–132; 128; 130; 21; 139–140; 149; 57–58; 56; 145; 129; 137–138; 141–142; 147–148; 150–152; 133–134; 144; 33–35; 40–42; 94–96; 118–120.

Group II. 29–32; 36–39; 50–52; 27–28; 61; 43–45; 48; 75; 49; 88–93; 97–99; 109–117; 122–125; 26; 25; 23–24; 46–47; 77; 76; 78–80; 82–87; 121; 146.

Group III. 1–8; 10; 9; 11–20; 53–55; 100–108; 59–60; 126; 22; 62–74; 81.

François Victor Hugo (1857)

Group I. 135–136; 143; 145; 128; [Sonnet from *Pass. Pilg.*]; 139–140; 127; 131–132; 130; 21; 149; 137–138; 147–148; 141; 150; 142; 152; 154–155; 151; 129.

Group II. 133–134; 144.

Group III. 33–35; 40–42.

Group IV. 26; 23; 25; 20; 24; 46–47; 29–31; 121; 36; 66; 39; 50–51; 48; 52; 75; 56; 27–28; 61; 43–45; 97–99; 53; 109–120; 77; 122–125; 94–96; 69; 67–68; 70; 49; 88–93; 57–58; 78; 38; 79–80; 82–87; 32.

Group V. 146; 100–103; 105; 76; 106; 59.

Group VI. 126; 104; 1–19; 60; 73; 37; 22; 62; 71–72; 74; 81; 64; 63; 65; 108; 107; 54–55.

Cartwright (1859)

Group I. 1–20; [Sonnet from *Pass. Pilg.*]; 53–55.

Group II. 100–108; 59–60; 25–26; 29–32; 109–112; 121; 36–39; 50–52; 48; 76; 78–80; 82–87; 49; 88–93; 67–70; 126; 77.

Group III. 33–35; 40–42; 94–96; 62–66; 81; 71–74; 116–120; 122–125.

Group IV. 21–24; 27–28; 61; 43–47; 75; 56–58; 97–99; 113–115; 153–154; 128; 145; 130; 127; 131–132; 135–136; 143; 139–140; 149; 137–138; 141–142; 147–148; 150–152; 144; 133–134; 129; 146.

Bodenstedt (1862)

Group I. [Sonnet from *Pass. Pilg.*]; 128; [Sonnet from *Pass. Pilg.*]; 135–136; 143; 23; 121; 153–154; 152; 137; 151; 145; 149–150; 141–142; 75; 147–148; 130; 127; 132; 131; 138; 46–47; 113–114; 57; 97–99; 56; 96; 95; 88; 87; 89; 139–140; 129.

Group II. 133–134; 144; 33–35; 40–42; 26; 20; 24; 29–31; 36; 66; 39; 38; 48; 52; 50–51; 27–28; 61; 43–45; 53; 80; 82; 85–86; 78–79; 37; 58; 49; 62; 83; 70; 69; 67–68; 93; 81; 71; 74; 32.

Group III. 1–19; 22; 21; 126; 110–112; 84; 64–65; 107–108.

Group IV. 100; 109; 118; 90; 92; 125; 119–120; 117; 103; 63; 104–106; 122; 115–116; 73; 72; 91; 76; 101–102; 59–60; 54–55; 123; 94; 146; 124; 77; 25.

DELIUS (?) (1864)

I. (Will.) 135–136; 143.
II. (Black eyes.) 127; 131–132.
III. (Virginal.) 128.
IV. (False Compare.) 130; 21.
V. (Tyranny.) 139–140; 149.
VI. (Slavery.) 57–58.
VII. (Coldness.) 56.
VIII. (I hate not you.) 145.
IX. (Love and Hatred.) 129; 137–138; 141–142; 147–148; 150–152.
X. (Infidelity.) 133–134; 144.
XI. (Injury.) 33–35; 40–42.
XII. (A Friend's Faults.) 94–96.
XIII. (Forgiveness.) 118–120.
XIV. (Confiding Friendship.) 29–32.
XV. (Humility.) 36–39.
XVI. (Absence.) 50–52; 27–28; 61; 43–45.
XVII. (Estrangement.) 48; 75; 49; 88–93.
XVIII. (A Second Absence.) 97–99.
XIX. (Fidelity.) 109–117; 122–125.
XX. (Dedications.) 26; 25; 23.
XXI. (The Picture.) 24; 46–47.
XXII. (The Note-Book.) 77.
XXIII. (Rivalry.) 76; 78–80; 82–87.
XXIV. (Reputation.) 121.
XXV. (The Soul.) 146.
XXVI. (The Poet to a Friend.) 1–19.
XXVII. (The Friend's Beauty.) 20; 53–55.
XXVIII. (Immortality of Verse.) 100–108; 59–60.
XXIX. (Death.) 126; 22; 62–74; 81.
XXX. (Cupid.) 153–154.

MASSEY (1866–1888)

I. (Sh. to Southampton.) 1–26; 38.
II. (Southampton to Elizabeth Vernon.) 29–31.
III. (Sh. to Southampton.) 32.
IV. (Elizabeth Vernon to Southampton.) 33–35; 41–42.
V. (Elizabeth Vernon to Lady Rich.) 133–134; 40.
VI. (Elizabeth Vernon; Soliloquy.) 144.
VII. (Sh. to Southampton.) 39.
VIII. (Southampton to Elizabeth Vernon.) 36–37; 27–28; 43; 61; 44–52; 56.
IX. (Sh. to Southampton.) 53–55; 59–60; 62–65.
X. (Elizabeth Vernon; Soliloquy.) 66–69.
XI. (Sh. to Southampton.) 70–74; 76–86.

XII. (Southampton to Elizabeth Vernon.) 87; 75; 88–93.
XIII. (Elizabeth Vernon to Southampton.) 94–96.
XIV. (Southampton to Elizabeth Vernon.) 97–99.
XV. (Sh. to Southampton.) 100–106; 108.
XVI. (Southampton to Elizabeth Vernon.) 109–114; 117–122.
XVII. (Sh. to Southampton and Elizabeth Vernon.) 116.
XVIII. (Southampton; Soliloquy.) 123–125.
XIX. (Sh. to Southampton.) 115; 107; [126; misplaced fragment].
XX. (William Herbert.) 127–132; 135–143; 57–58; 145–154.

Stengel (1881)

[1–126 *only*]

26; 1; 4; 8; 7; 11; 3; 5–6; 2; 9–10; 12; 20; 14; 13; 15–17; 59; 106; 53; 105; 54; 104; 81; 55; 64; 19; 63; 65; 60; 107; 18; 126; 108; 77; 122; 100–101; 38; 23; 73–74; 32; 39; 78–79; 82; 21; 76; 103; 83; 85; 80; 86; 71–72; 102; 84; 58; 57; 67–68; 123; 66; 116; 115; 124; 25; 29–31; 37; 125; 91–94; 69–70; 33–35; 95–96; 40–42; 36; 87; 50–51; 27–28; 43; 61–62; 22; 24; 46–47; 44–45; 97–99; 48–49; 88–90; 109; 117; 110; 121; 111–112; 75; 52; 113–114; 118–120; 56.

Von Mauntz (1894)

Group I. 128; [3 sonnets from *L. L. L.*]; 145; 135–136; 57–58; 127; 138; 149; 132; 131; 151; 150; 148; 142; 141; 130; 139; 152; 147; 140; 137; 144; 41–42; 143; 129; 146.

Group II. 1–17; 23; 26; 20; 59; 106; 22; 62; 53; 39; 126; 68; 64; 21; 103; 76; 108; 105; 38; 78–80; 86; 85; 83–84; 82; 77; 70; 67; 69; 94–96; 104; 49; [*The Phœnix and Turtle*]; 56; 29; 116; 100; 102; 32; 73; 71–72; 74; 101; 54; 18–19; 60; 65; 55; 63; 81; 115; 124; 107; 122; 33–36; 97–99; 40; 133–134; 123; 125.

Group III. 24; 46–47; 25; 30–31; 37; 52; 50–51; 113–114; 27–28; 43; 61; 48; 44–45; 87–93; 109–112; 117–120; 75; 121; 66; 153–154.

Butler (1899)

1–32; 121; 33–34; 36–39; 127–128; 130–132; 137–144; 135–136; 151; 35; 40–42; 134; 133; 152; 43–118; 147–150; 119–120; 122–125.

Appendix: 126; 129; 145; 146; 153–154.

Godwin (1900)

I. (The Central and Explanatory Sonnet.) 77.
II. (The Independents or Solitaries.) 145; 126; 153–154; 19; 122; 81; 63; 26.
III. (A Plea for Creative or Poetic Art.) 12; 1; 4; 10; 3; 5–6; 2; 11; 9; 13; 7–8; 15–17; 14.
IV. (A Young Love-Time.) 25; 21; 130; 18; 104; 22; 32; 50–51; 27–28; 44–47; 52; 30–31; 48; 116; 115; 137; 54; 69–70; 121; 94; 66–68; 73; 71–72; 74; 97–99; 29.
V. (The Episode of the Dark Lady.) 23; 127; 131–132; 24; 141; 140; 149; 138;

128; 136; 135; 142; 139; 61; 58; 143; 57; 134; 133; 41; 40; 42; 35; 151; 150; 147–148; 144; 146; 95–96; 120; 152; 87; 109; 119; 129.

VI. (The Poet's Communion with the Higher Muse.) 38; 43; 113–114; 53; 20; 106; 59; 75; 64–65; 60; 62; 103; 39; 37; 36; 76; 78–79; 82–85; 80; 86; 49; 88–93; 33–34; 56; 100–101; 107; 110–112; 117–118; 107–108; 123–125; 105; 55.

STOPES (1904)

I. (Poetical Experiments.) 153–154.
II. (Urging the Youth to marry.) 1–7; 12; 11.
III. (Personal affection develops.) 8–10; 13–19; 24; 20–21; 25; 22.
IV. (Complimentary Badinage.) 127; 132; 128; 149; 145; 138; 130.
V. (The Poet sends Manuscripts.) 23; 26.
VI. (His Friend's Love.) 29; 112; 30–32.
VII. (Temptations.) 148; 141; 131; 140; 139; 150.
VIII. (Departure.) 50–51; 44–47.
IX. (Travel.) 27–28.
X. (After return sees the lady.) 136; 151–152; 142–143; 135.
XI. (Hears that his friend superseded him.) 33–34; 41; 40; 42; 35.
XII. (Reproaches the Lady.) 133–134.
XIII. (Love's Fever.) 137; 147; 144.
XIV. (The Poet's Meditations.) 146; 129.
XV. (Gift to reconciled Friend.) 77.
XVI. (Beauty and Time.) 62–63; 60; 64–65; 55.
XVII. (Rumours concerning Rivals.) 75; 48–49; 88–90; 121; 36; 91–93.
XVIII. (The Rivals.) 76; 78–80; 82–87.
XIX. (Healing of the Breach.) 57–58; 43; 61; 56.
XX. (He feels old and weary.) 73–74; 71–72; 81.
XXI. (Absence, which gives pain.) 97–99; 53.
XXII. (The Friend is coming of age.) 104–106; 59.
XXIII. (Gossip concerning Friend.) 66–68; 54; 94; 69; 95–96; 70.
XXIV. (The Poet forgets to sing.) 100; 103; 101–102; 52; 39; 37–38; 108.
XXV. (Clears himself from charge of faithlessness.) 122; 109–111; 117–118; 113–114; 119–120.
XXVI. (Triumph of Love over Time.) 115–116; 123; 107; 124–125.
XXVII. (Time's Control of Nature.) 126.

WALSH (1908)

I. (Early Miscellaneous Sonnets.) 145; 154; 153. [With sonnets from the *Pass. Pilg.* and the plays.]
II. (To his Fair Effeminate Friend.) 20; 53; 59; 106; 67–68; 54; 18–19; 60; 63–65; 15–17; 1; 7; 14; 12; 11; 8; 3; 2; 9–10; 13; 4; 5–6.
III. (To his Dark Disdainful Mistress.) 21; 130; 127; 132; 131; 24; 46–47; 128; 136.
IV. (On his Loves.) 50–51; 27–28; 61; 48; 52; 75; 44–45; 97; 43; 113–114;

98–99; 57–58; 33–34; 120; 118; 111–112; 109; 117; 110; 119; 29; 25; 22; 37; 62; 39; 36; 71–74; 81; 91; 49; 88–90; 92.

V. (Episode of the Dark Mistress Wooing the Fair Friend.) 144; 133–134; 40–42; 35; 143; 135; 138; 151; 139–140; 93; 142; 94–96; 69; 137; 148–150; 141; 147; 152.

VI. (On the Constancy of the Poet's Love, in spite of the Decay of Beauty.) 100–102; 56; 105; 108; 104; 124–125; 123; 115–116; 107; 55.

VII. (Sonnets addressed to his Patron.) 26; 38; 23; 103; 76; 78–79; 84; 82–83; 86; 80; 85; 32.

VIII. (Late Miscellaneous Sonnets.) 77; 122; 70; 87; 129; 121; 146; 66; 30–31.

THE DATE OF COMPOSITION*

THE date question is perhaps the most tantalizing of all the problems in the Sonnets. Theories regarding other problems at least have the advantage that, since there is no positive evidence anywhere, one argument has as much importance as another. For the date question, however, there are just enough accepted facts to check the critical Pegasus in mid-career. They are these: (1) In Francis Meres's *Palladis Tamia* (1598) occurs the sentence, "As the soule of Euphorbus was thought to live in Pythagoras, so the sweete wittie soule of Ovid lives in mellifluous and hony-tongued Shakespeare, witnes his *Venus and Adonis*, his *Lucrece*, his sugred Sonnets among his private friends." (2) In 1599 Jaggard brought out *The Passionate Pilgrim*, in which were included Sonnets 138 and 144, which Mrs. STOPES (*Ath.*, 1898, 374, 405) calls "the two maturest, the climax of the whole series." (3) In 1609 Thorpe published the whole number of Sonnets as we have them now. Every theorist adds to these dates certain "indisputable" dates of his own, based on internal evidence; but none of them approach in definiteness these three. And these do not give any direct clue to the date or dates of composition, save that the sonnets pirated by Jaggard suggest that the whole story has been acted to the end, and that it has been among the "private friends" for some time;† — otherwise Jaggard could not have secured the two.

Of other external evidence, much consists of references which are applied to the Sonnets in order to prove some theory in regard to "Mr. W. H." or the Dark Lady. Thus ISAAC places the love-sonnets in 1591–92 because of a reference in Nash's *Piers Penniless* (1592): "Sometimes . . . he will be an Inamorato Poeta, and sonnet a whole quire of paper in praise of Ladie Maniebetter, his yelow-faced mistress" (see note at end of S. 130); and also finds a reference to Sh. in Nash's *Anatomie of Absurditie* (1590), where mention is made of "new found songs and sonnets, which every red-nosed fiddler hath at his fingers' end." (*Jahrb.*, 19: 211.) SARRAZIN very properly criticises these clues as doubtful (*Jahrb.*, 31: 218 ff.).

In 1593, Sh. alluded to *Venus & Adonis* as "the first heir of my invention"; may this set bounds for the beginning of the Sonnets? (GOLLANCZ, Preface to Temple ed., xi-xii.) But it is possible that Sh. did not consider occasional sonnets as a formal expression of his invention; the quotation, too, is from a dedication to a patron.

CORNEY (*N. & Q.*, 3d s., 1: 87) suggests that the dedication to *Lucrece* (1594) — "What I have done is yours; what I have to do is yours" — is a promise, of which the Sonnets are the fulfilment. But "what I have to do" may mean just as well "whatever I hope to accomplish at any time."

* [This section was prepared by Miss MARGERY BAILEY, A. M. — ED.]
† But even this is disputed; see ROLFE'S note at the end of S. 144.

FLEAY and several other critics have found a reference to the sonnet-story in *Willobie his Avisa* (1594); but for the doubtful basis for this notion, see below, pp. 478–82.

Returning for a moment to the allusion in *Palladis Tamia*, we may note that some critics (as FLEAY) use this date (1598) to limit that of the whole series; but MACKAIL doubts whether Meres alluded to this particular series at all; GRAY (*Publ. M. L. A.*, 1915) holds that "only the 'sugred' sonnets need come before 1598, and indeed it is more appropriate that the others should not"; TYLER and ARCHER also believe that Meres was not speaking of the entire series.

Internal "evidence" for the date problem is named legion, but much of it may receive the title of balderdash. Every theory seems able to twist every other to its own use. We may consider the evidence under four heads: (I) Interpretations of sonnet wording; (II) The relation of the Southampton-Pembroke-Dark Lady controversy to the question of date; (III) Parallels with other authors; (IV) Parallels with other works of Sh.

I. In S. 2 Sh. describes a man of forty as old, and this furnishes BUTLER with a starting-point for his early dating of the Sonnets, on the simple ground that no one could have written the sonnet who was much over twenty-one; hence it may be dated 1585!

S. 14 is the first which has been thought to allude to contemporary events. FLEAY finds in it reference to the plagues of 1592–3, the dearths of 1594–6, and the irregularity of the seasons in 1595–6. ARCHER replies (*Fort. Rev.*, n.s., 62: 817) that the passage is very general in tone, but that, even if it were taken literally, 1597 or 1598 would be found as appropriate. (Needless to say, Fleay is a Southamptonist and Archer a Pembrokist!)

The "pupil pen" of S. 16 is supposed by STEEVENS to be a "slight proof that the poems before us were our author's earliest compositions." BUTLER and GOLLANCZ approve this suggestion; WALSH and PORTER incline to ARCHER'S interpretation of the phrase as one of exaggerated humility. This applies to the similar view, taken by MALONE, of the "poor rude lines" of S. 32.

FLEAY believes the "books" of S. 23 to be *Venus & Adonis* and *Lucrece;* hence this sonnet, with all which contain "repeated references to the *Lucrece* dedication" (18, 26, 34, 81, 108), must come later than May, 1594.

Sonnets 27, 48, and 50, the "Travel Sonnets," FLEAY uses to show that the players were touring the provinces — probably in 1593 or 1597, on account of the plague. As an alternative we are offered the possibility that Sh. was rusticating in Bristol or Dover, waiting for the ire of Sir John Oldcastle (who considered himself maligned in *Henry IV*, 1597) to cool. "In all probability the later date is the correct one." SARRAZIN, however, holds to the early date, since he thinks that these sonnets were written on the occasion of the poet's leaving the estate of Southampton, where he had remained during the plague of 1593.

The "precious friends" of S. 30 FLEAY explains to be Marlowe (died 1593) and Sh.'s son Hamnet (died 1596). For S. 35 we have the assumption that the

eclipse of the moon and sun refers to a period when Sh. was out of favor with the Queen or the court, and with Southampton; "and no such date can I find but 1597, *circa* June." These notes characterize Fleay's whole method, and those of similar theorists. We have, of course, no reason for thinking that "precious friends" refers to definite persons; and a reference to S. 35 will show that Fleay twists the whole meaning awry. Incidentally, as GRAY observes, Sh. produced *Love's Labour's Lost* at court in 1597 — hardly an indication of disgrace.

Sonnets 62 and 63 contain references to the poet's age: "tann'd antiquity," "Time's injurious hand," etc. (See also 22, 1; 73; 138, 6.) ARCHER claims that they must have been written at a time when the poet could, without too great poetic license, have described himself as old in contrast with his friend. FLEAY, LEE, and others, on the other hand, have shown that such expressions were conventional in the period (see notes on the sonnets in question).

S. 66, according to GARNETT (see note on line 9), aims a blow at the suppression of the theatres ordered in July, 1597, in the phrase "art made tongue-tied by authority." Other interpretations are at least equally plausible.

The "shame" of S. 72 (with the "motley" of 110 and the "brand" of 111) are referred by FLEAY not to the mere profession of player, but to a particular occasion, especially the Oldcastle affair — again — of 1597. It is also possible that the "vulgar scandal" of 112 and the "vile esteemed" of 121 belong with them. The expressions of 112 TYLER relates to a private scandal and a theatrical quarrel of about 1601 (see the notes).

In S. 76 the words "invention in a noted weed" and "new-found methods" are also rich in possibilities. Was Sh. writing when the sonnet was *noted* because it was the height of fashion, about 1594 (GRAY, *Publ. M. L. A.*, 1915), or after the fashion had spent itself in the various sonnet sequences? The word seems to preclude the belief that he wrote many of the Sonnets at a time when the fashion was just coming in — about 1590 (BEECHING, Intro., p. xxiii). If we inquire as to Sh.'s attitude toward the sonnet form, FLEAY notes that in *L. L. L.* he uses sonnets in dialogue, and quite seriously; they are spoken of (IV, iii) as a means of gaining favor in love. In *T. G. V.* (III, ii, 68, 92) Proteus recommends the form to Thurio, and the Duke approves the "force of heaven-bred poesy." The choruses of *R. & J.* (1598) are sonnets; after this there exist no evidences of favor toward it (unless the letter of Helena, in sonnet form, in *A.W.*, III, iv, — of uncertain date). SARRAZIN (*Jahrb.*, 34: 368) notes that in the middle dramas the art is made laughable (*M. W. W.*, I, i, 206; *M. Ado*, V, ii, 4; *A. Y. L.*, III, iv, 25; *H. 5*, III, vii, 42; *A.W.*, IV, iii, 355); only exaggerated or comic figures practice it. Certainly the inferences from all this are not definite. It is possible that Sh. ceased to use the sonnet in plays as soon as he discovered its power as an instrument of sincere self-expression; at any rate, the serious employment of sonnets in the plays is in the early, "italianate" style. FLEAY implies that the "noted weed" restrains the sonnets within the bounds of its popularity, ending about 1595; but see MACKAIL's notes (under S. 76) to the effect that Sh. refers to his use of "a poetical form which was

passing out of vogue." On the other hand, the phrase may not refer to the sonnet form at all, but merely to the familiar dress of the poet's language of praise.

Sonnets 79, 80, and 86, raise the question of the connection between the date problem and that of the Rival Poet. (For this, see the separate discussion, pp. 472–77.) The uncertainty here is too great to admit of useful inferences. It may be noted that those who identify the rival poet as Marlowe assume, of course, a very early date. On the other hand, Chapman's *Seven Iliades* appeared in 1598, and TYLER considers this to fix the date of the sonnets concerned; "in 1599 it was still a new book, likely to excite the interest of Mr. W. H."

Of the words "spite of fortune" in S. 90, BEECHING asks: "Does this refer to the troubles of Sh.'s company, due to the popularity of boy actors?" — i.e., in 1601. See the notes on the sonnet, for other suggestions respecting Sh.'s troubles. Nothing could be less conclusive.

In S. 98 WYNDHAM discovers a new clue in the allusion to "heavy Saturn," leading him to date the sonnet in 1601 or 1602. See the notes for his reasoning, and some comment thereon.

S. 100 has suggested some vain clues to a date, coming apparently after a period of silence; but the inferences drawn are various and indefinite (see the notes).

S. 104 has been called a "key-sonnet" for the date, but roams pretty wildly about the calendar of the years. Here SARRAZIN'S argument, based on points of style, is of most interest (see the notes for some account of it); it results in the date of 1595, with 1592 for the earlier sonnets. At best it is only for the relative dating of different portions of the series that this sonnet has any more significance than any other.

S. 107, in the view of many critics, gives the only definite evidence of date. The notes set forth the character of this evidence in full, and show that, while the majority of critics infer the date either of 1601 or 1603, there is a hopeless want of agreement even on the question whether the allusions of the sonnet are to historical events at all.

The same thing is true of S. 124, with two theories standing out conspicuously: that there is reference to the execution of Essex, 1601, and that there is reference to the Jesuit powder plot of 1605. See also the notes on 125, 13, where those favoring the "Essex theory" find further support for their opinion.

Finally, on S. 144 see Professor GRAY'S discussion of the possible relation of this sonnet to the two versions of *Love's Labour's Lost*. In a MS. note he has summed up his view as follows: "This sonnet *must* have been written after the additions to *L. L. L.* in 1597–98; for it is a psychological impossibility that Sh. could have treated his 'black' heroine in the heart-whole and care-free way he does in his revision of that drama, after this tormenting doubt had got hold of him. And as this sonnet, and 138, were published in 1599, we may safely date the crucial event in the story of the Sonnets as occurring in 1598 or 1599."

II. For the Pembroke-Southampton question, one must refer chiefly to the

outline found in pp. 464–68 below. The inferences from the two theories respecting dates may be noted here, and to this end one should have in mind an outline of the early lives of the two earls.

Henry Wriothesley was born in 1573, nine years after Sh.; he became Earl of Southampton on the death of his father in 1581, and was brought up as a "child of state" under Lord Burleigh, who in 1590 wrote of his desire to marry the young man to Burleigh's granddaughter; Southampton, however, did not care to marry. In 1593 Sh. dedicated to him *V. & A.*, and in 1594 *Lucrece*. In 1595 he fell in love with Elizabeth Vernon, and in 1598 secretly married her, thus losing the favor of the Queen. In 1601 he was implicated in the Essex conspiracy, and imprisoned in the Tower, being liberated only on the accession of James in 1603. Thereafter he was active in public life, civil and military, until his death in 1624.

William Herbert was born in 1580, sixteen years after Sh. In 1597 it is known that he was desired by his family to marry, but refused, and won consent to a period of life in town, coming to London in 1598. In 1600 began his intrigue with Mary Fitton, one of the Queen's maids; their illegitimate son was born in 1601, and both lovers were imprisoned for a time by Elizabeth. In the same year Herbert became Earl of Pembroke, on the death of his father. Like Southampton, he returned to favor at court only on the accession of James. In 1604 he married Lady Mary Talbot, — apparently for a fortune. In 1623 Heminge and Condell dedicated to him and his brother the First Folio of Sh.'s plays, on the ground that they had "prosecuted the plays and their author living with much favor." He lived till 1630.

It is obvious that if the Pembroke theory be accepted, the evidence points to a relatively late date for the Sonnets; the first group (urging to marry) cannot date earlier than 1597 or 1598. The "three years" of 104 would then conform to the suggestions found for the date 1601 in certain of the later ones. On the other hand, if we accept the Southampton theory, the earlier sonnets might date anywhere from 1590 to 1595, the period of Sh.'s first plays and first poems, and one would assume that the whole number of sonnets had been written (with possible individual exceptions) before the publication of *The Passionate Pilgrim* in 1599.

The Dark Lady has not received much attention as affecting the question of date, since there is no important claim for identification here, except in connection with the Pembroke theory. It has been noticed, however, that dark ladies appear in certain of the plays; — chiefly, unfortunately, in one of early date (*Love's Labour's Lost*) and in another — in which the lady is at her witching best — of late date (*Antony & Cleopatra*). DOWDEN observes that in the later play the poet seems to be safely reminiscent, rather than deeply involved in a love-affair. The dark lady of *L. L. L.* is treated more tenderly than Cleopatra, — and this play is thought to have been produced no later than 1591. Notice, however, the interesting theory of GRAY (*Publ. M. L. A.*, 1915): "In 1597–98 Sh. revised *L. L. L.*, and . . . added all those portions which refer to Rosaline as 'dark.' The Rosaline of 1590 or so was a 'whitely wanton with a velvet

brow,' and an irresponsible madcap. The later added portions deepen her character, as they do that of her lover, Biron. . . . It is notable that the analogies . . . between the 'early' play and the Sonnets occur almost wholly in the additions of 1597–98. . . . But Sh. could not in 1597 have made such a point of the 'blackness' of his heroine, and have treated her with such easy grace, just after his betrayal by the Dark Lady of the Sonnets. And . . . the two sonnets contained in the *Passionate Pilgrim* (1599) come after this crucial event. 1598 would accordingly be the year of the 'key sonnet' (144), and from this date we should have to build out our sequence." SARRAZIN, on the other hand, thinks that the wooing lady must have been of the same period as the Venus of *Venus & Adonis;* we need not follow him in his discovery of her in upper Italy, during an hypothetical journey thither of Sh.'s in 1592. Mrs. STOPES has another conjecture: the lady was Jaquinetta Vautrollier, the French wife of Field, the printer, and the intrigue took place in 1595–96, just before Field signed the petition against the Blackfriars Theatre. Finally, those critics who, like FLEAY and ACHESON, identify her with the heroine of *Willobie his Avisa,* must suppose that the affair shortly preceded the issue of that book, in 1594.

From all of which it is evident that our need of information respecting the date of the Sonnets, in order to identify the friend and the lady, is neither more nor less great than the need of such identification in order to throw light on the question of the date.

III. For the question of parallels with other authors, see especially the following section of the Appendix. We should note, in the first place, that the sonnet fashion began to be noticeable with the posthumous appearance of Sidney's Sonnets, 1591, and the publication of the first edition of Daniel's *Delia,* 1592. The influence of both these works on Sh. is generally admitted, and is consistent with almost all the theories as to the date of his Sonnets, though naturally emphasized by those who place them early. In the case of Drayton, whose sonnets first appeared in 1594, the question of the borrower is disputed (see the details below); but since both sides admit that whatever borrowing there was probably depended on the reading of MS. poems rather than of published ones, the decision could not in any case be used as proof of the date of composition. The same thing is true of the alleged parallels between the Sonnets and Marlowe's *Hero & Leander,* with which it may be assumed that Sh. was familiar long before its publication in 1598. Other parallels, such as some which have been noted for the sonnets of Constable, give no clue whatever (even if they are due to something other than coincidence) as to which passage was the original.

In S. 32, 12 TYLER discovers a borrowing from Marston's *Pigmalion's Image* (1598); but it will be seen by a reference to the notes that the inference is baseless. In like manner, he traces the phrasing of S. 55 to Meres's language in *Palladis Tamia* (1598), and some have found this plausible; but the notes on the sonnet, again, will show how doubtful is the inference.

Sonnets 94 and 142 contain interesting parallels with the play of *Edward VI,* published 1596, which to a number of critics, such as DELIUS and ISAAC, have

made it appear that these sonnets were in circulation in 1595, — the dramatist being the apparent borrower. On the other hand, see GRAY's note, quoted under S. 94, for an interesting contrary conjecture.

IV. Parallels with other writings of Sh., while lacking in evidential definiteness, form on the whole the most promising of all the kinds of internal evidence for the date of the Sonnets. Of the efforts to arrange and draw inferences from this material, the most important is that made by ISAAC in his article in the *Jahrbuch* for 1884. The only drawback is his subjective rearrangement of the Sonnets in ten groups based on content, with the assumption that all the sonnets in each group are of substantially the same date. But his parallels can, of course, be used apart from this. First of all, Isaac divides the mass of the Sonnets into two portions: (1) those which may be termed conventional, dealing with platonic love and other familiar Renaissance themes, forming eight of his ten "cycles"; and (2) those which may be called original, bearing no resemblance to any other contemporary product. The former group he finds paralleled by the relatively light and thoughtless manner of the early plays and poems, the latter by the broader outlook and the melancholy of later plays. Coming to the more particular parallels in thought and style, he finds that in the more conventional Sonnets there are five such parallels suggestive of Sh.'s early work to one of later work, indicating the period closing with 1592; on the other hand, the maturer sonnets show few resemblances to the early plays, but a preponderance of parallels with the plays of the period of *2 Henry IV* and *Hamlet*. Very few parallels, again, appear for the late plays.

An independent study of this phase of the subject has been made by Mr. HORACE DAVIS, whose manuscript notes have been deposited, for the use of students of the Sonnets, in the Library of Stanford University. In order to compare his work with that of Isaac, the approximate numbers of parallels listed by both critics are enumerated in the following table; and there is added for each play a conjectured date, based on a combination of two recent tables of such dates — that of MacCracken and Pierce, in *An Introduction to Sh.* (1910), and that of Neilson and Thorndike, in *The Facts about Sh.* (1913).

	Number of Sonnets parallels noted	
	by ISAAC	*by* DAVIS
Love's Labour's Lost (1590–91; revised 1597–98)	34	49
Comedy of Errors (1590–91)	12	22
1 Henry VI (1590–91)	15	12
2 Henry VI (1590–92)	21	14
3 Henry VI (1590–92)	14	17
Two Gentlemen of Verona (1591–92)	31	35
Romeo & Juliet (1591, revised 1596–97; or 1594–95)	48	48
Venus & Adonis (1592)	37	64
Richard III (1592–93)	25	24
King John (1592-93)	17	22
Lucrece (1593–94)	39	60
Titus Andronicus (1593–94)	10	18

	Number of Sonnets parallels noted by Isaac	by Davis
Midsummer Night's Dream (1593–95)	18	45
Richard II (1593–95)	21	26
Merchant of Venice (1594–96)	7	23
Taming of the Shrew (1596–97)	8	7
1 Henry IV (1597)	8	10
2 Henry IV (1598)	13	13
Merry Wives of Windsor (1598–99)	6	7
Much Ado about Nothing (1599)	9	7
Henry V (1599)	3	7
As You Like It (1599–1600)	26	13
Julius Cæsar (1599–1601)	1	3
Twelfth Night (1601)	14	15
Troilus & Cressida (1601–02)	24	16
All's Well that Ends Well (1602)	11	10
Hamlet (1602–04)	17	15
Measure for Measure (1603)	14	8
Othello (1604)	6	12
King Lear (1604–06)	2	11
Macbeth (1605–06)	3	5
Antony & Cleopatra (1607–08)	14	7
Timon of Athens (1607–08)	5	4
Pericles (1607–08)	7	0
Coriolanus (1609)	4	4
Cymbeline (1610)	13	7
Winter's Tale (1610–11)	5	6
The Tempest (1611)	3	2
Henry VIII (1612–13)	7	4

Considering the remarkably subjective character of the method of selection of such parallels, one must regard the general tendency to coincidence in these two lists as fairly significant. On the other hand, it is obvious that when they are applied to the question of the date of composition of the Sonnets, various queries must be noted. The character of a given play is significant: if it is largely prose, like the *Merry Wives*, the small number of parallels counts for nothing. Some will have it that the *character* of the parallels is of much more importance than the number: the mass of resemblances to the early plays, it is said, is made up of conventional ideas and expressions, which might be recalled and used again years after their first employment, whereas the resemblances to *Hamlet* and *Troilus & Cressida* are less conventional and more significant. Further, one must note the annoying circumstance that the two plays which stand at the head of both Isaac's and Davis's lists, for the number of parallels (*Love's Labour's Lost* and *Romeo & Juliet*), are thought to have been revised about 1597, so that they can be used in support of the claims of both the first and the second period.

SARRAZIN followed up Isaac's studies of parallels, to some extent supporting his method but reaching rather different conclusions. Like Isaac, he emphasizes the rhetorical conventions of the love-sonnets, counting them to be the earliest: there are rhetorical questions and answers (as in 135, 137, 148, 149); the style is fantastic, toying with trifles, full of the casuistry of love; a close, sultry air hangs over them, that of the city rather than the field and woods. The manner of the "sonnets of procreation" (the opening group) is close to that of the love-sonnets, but riper and rather more artistic; it corresponds somewhat to that between *Venus & Adonis* and *Lucrece*. Antitheses, repeated words, and the like, are still abundant; but the tone is less agitated and restless, more moderate and contemplative; the diction is richer in metaphor — sometimes to the point of profusion and contradiction, as in Sh.'s later style — and has now the breath of out-door air, with images drawn especially from summer and autumn. (*Sh.'s Lehrjahre*, pp. 155, 171.) In his articles in the *Jahrbuch* (1896 and 1898), Sarrazin considers more in detail characteristics of style like repeated words, plays on repeated or reversed phrasing, and the like, and also the mere word-likenesses which may be grouped as "dislegomena" and "trislegomena"; the general conclusion being that the greater portion of the Sonnets date from the period of *Love's Labour's Lost*, *Romeo & Juliet*, *Venus & Adonis*, *Richard III*, and *Lucrece*, or 1592–95.

Other critics, basing their judgment rather on general impressions of the parallelism with the plays, reach various conclusions. KRAUSS and VON MAUNTZ agree substantially with Sarrazin, emphasizing the resemblances to *Venus & Adonis*. DOWDEN observes that the Sh. of the Sonnets is the man who wrote *Venus & Adonis* and *Romeo & Juliet* — about to acquire the bitter experience later reflected in *Measure for Measure* and *Troilus;* some of the Sonnets, as 64–74, may be thought to echo the tone of these later plays and of *Hamlet*. TYLER holds that there is no key like the Sonnets for the understanding of *Troilus & Cressida*. GOODLET, in his article in *Poet Lore*, 1891, emphasizes the connection of the Sonnets with the story of *Two Gentlemen of Verona*, and believes that they probably preceded the play. E. K. CHAMBERS "would go to the stake for it," that the language and thought of the Sonnets are those of the plays written during the years 1592–94 (*Academy*, July 31, 1897). WYNDHAM would place the earliest groups (as 1–42) before 1599, but believes that the melancholy languor, metaphysical speculation, and poetical perfection, of the group 56–125 display an affinity for *Hamlet*. BEECHING is especially impressed by the parallels with *Henry IV*, and goes so far as to say — what is scarcely warranted — that the greater number of parallels "hitherto recognised" are found in the two parts of that play, in *Love's Labour's Lost*, and in *Hamlet*. Since *Love's Labour's Lost* was revised in 1597, the date also of *1 Henry IV*, the period beginning about that time seems particularly likely. MACKAIL goes still further in this direction, asserting that "in the large majority of the Sonnets, the power of thought, the charged fulness of language, the compressed and allusive style, are qualities not of the Sh. of *Venus & Adonis*, not of the Sh. of *A Midsummer Night's Dream;* . . .

they are those of the Sh. who has fully mastered his art in the great comedies, who has deepened his hold on life and the human soul to the potency of the great tragedies; they are those . . . of the Sh. who is face to face with the whole vexing sorrow of the world, the Sh. who was writing or preparing himself to write *Hamlet* and *Troilus & Cressida*." (*Lectures on Poetry*, p. 191.) GRAY emphasizes the likeness between the Sonnets and the theme of the love of an older man for a younger as appearing in *The Merchant of Venice* — "the exaltation of friendship, and the isolation and self-pity of Antonio." He also notes the Sonnets mood of "out of favor with fortune but happy in love" as being closely akin to that of Romeo, and adds, "No correspondence of phrase could be half so significant as this amazing similarity of idea." Professor Gray finds, too, as we have seen, that the significant parallels with *Love's Labour's Lost* are to be thought of as belonging to the revision of 1597.

WALSH finds the argument from parallels suggestive of rather more liberal and less definite results than have been inferred by most of those who have used it. "The same characteristics that have led the editors to arrange the plays in a tolerably well-agreed-upon series are traceable in the sonnets. These characteristics are, that in his early writings Sh. showed a command of language superior to his thought, that in his middle period his language and thought matched each other, and that in his last period his thought outran the power of expression. S. 129 exhibits the characteristic of the last period, and S. 145 that of the first period, as plainly as do the *Tempest* and the *Comedy of Errors*." (Intro., p. 31.) His conclusion is that all the usual tests would result in stringing out the sonnets "over a tract of time beginning at least as early as 1592 and extending as late as 1603 and possibly 1605." This is in harmony with the opinion of FURNIVALL, who, while placing the Sonnets between the second and third periods of the plays, said that he believed they stretched "over many years." (Intro., p. lxvi.)

Finally, for the matter of parallels, we may note that some critics reject the whole method as invalid. Thus ARCHER sums up his convictions by saying, "Like occasions beget like expressions," and to GOLLANCZ's remark that no long time could have elapsed between *Romeo & Juliet* and Sonnet 116 he replies that five years could have passed quite as well as five days. (*Fort. Rev.*, n.s., 62: 821.) This view is also that of SWINBURNE, if one may judge from his mocking account, in the "Report of the Proceedings of the Newest Sh. Society," of a proof by parallels that *Love's Labour's Lost* and *Othello* are of the same date. (*A Study of Sh.*, Appendix.)

Casting up accounts, we have these arguments for an early date:

1. By far the larger number of parallels with the Sonnets are found in the poems and the early plays, indicating a common ground both for ideas and craftsmanship.

2. The situation in the Sonnets is also paralleled in early plays.

3. Ideas and images in the Sonnets are paralleled also in the poetry of others who wrote early; if they borrowed from Sh., he must have written very

early; if he borrowed from Marlowe, Sidney, and Daniel, it is natural to suppose that he did so under the influence of comparatively fresh impressions.

4. Meres mentions Sh.'s Sonnets as in familiar circulation in 1598; Jaggard prints in 1599 two which have been thought to tell the whole story.

5. The melancholy of the Sonnets may be attributed to the death of Sh.'s son in 1596 or to the ordinance against the theatres in 1597.

6. Sh.'s allusions to the sonnet form are early, and it is unlikely that he should have begun to write in that form after the height of its vogue was over.

7. To this we may add the Southampton theory of the friend, for those to whom that seems plausible.

For a later date, in Sh.'s middle period, we have these arguments:

1. Parallels with the later comedies and with the tragedies, though relatively few, are very striking; especially note the theme of the infidelity of woman.

2. The theme of dark beauty in *Love's Labour's Lost* shows some evidence of having been introduced in the revision of 1597.

3. The maturity of thought and style of a great number of the Sonnets points to the period of the poet's developed art.

4. The sincere ring of the allusions to weariness and age makes it doubtful that this "assumption of years" is wholly fictitious or conventional.

5. The melancholy of Sh. is quite well accounted for by events of 1601.

6. The only suspected allusions to contemporary events are commonly referred to 1601 or 1603.

7. To this is to be added the Pembroke theory, for those who find it plausible.

The outcome remains uncertain. Evidence for an early date for at least a certain number of the Sonnets seems to preponderate; but this need not be applied to the whole collection. If one follows the division made by Isaac and others into conventional and original groups, remembering also that the Sonnets themselves appear to refer to lapses of time between periods of composition, the seeming plausibility of the arguments for both the early and the middle period may be explained. The student's opinion as to the date of the larger number of the Sonnets will probably depend on his judgment respecting other matters which are equally uncertain with that of chronology.

The following table outlines, in a summary and necessarily arbitrary fashion, the opinions of the principal editors and critics who have discussed the question of date. A single date followed by a dash indicates the earliest limit proposed, with no definite view as to a *terminus ad quem*.

Acheson	1594–1600
Alden	1591 — (chiefly 1593–97)
Archer	1597 —
Beeching	1597–1603
Brandl	1591–1603 (chiefly 1591–94)
Butler	1585–88

Dowden	1592–1605
Fleay	1594–97
Gollancz	1595–98
Gray	1595–99
Isaac	1589 —
Lee	1594–1603 (chiefly 1594)
Mackail	1598–1603
Massey	1590–1603
Porter	Before 1598
Rolfe	1597 —
Sarrazin	1592 — (chiefly 1592–95)
Stopes	1592–96
Tyler	1598–1601
Walsh	1592–1603
Wyndham	1598–1603

SOURCES AND ANALOGUES*

THE age of discovery of sources and analogues is of course a late one, and for the Sonnets practically nothing was done in this direction prior to the last quarter of the nineteenth century. MALONE, to be sure, had remarked that "in these compositions Daniel's Sonnets, which were published in 1592, appear to me to have been the model that Sh. followed." (Boswell ed., 1821, 20: 217.) With this DRAKE agreed, emphasizing Daniel's influence on the metrical form of the sonnet, and observing that there is in Daniel "much of that tissue of abstract thought, and that reiteration of words," which distinguish the Sonnets of Sh. (*Sh. and his Times*, 2: 57.) The same subject was developed by DOWDEN, in his edition of 1881: "In reading Sidney, Spenser, Barnes, and still more Watson, Constable, Drayton, and others, although a large element of the art-pottery of the Renascence is common to them and Sh., the student of Sh.'s Sonnets does not feel at home. It is when we open Daniel's *Delia* that we recognize close kinship. The manner is the same, though the master proves himself of tardier imagination and less ardent temper. Diction, imagery, rhymes, and, in sonnets of like form, versification, distinctly resemble those of Sh. Malone was surely right when he recognized in Daniel the master of Sh. as a writer of Sonnets — a master quickly excelled by his pupil. And it is in Daniel that we find sonnet starting from sonnet almost in Sh.'s manner, only that Daniel often links poem with poem in more formal wise." (Intro., p. 27.) The matter was carefully examined by ISAAC in his article in the *Jahrbuch* for 1882, with the conclusion that Sh. felt the influence of the best work of Daniel, but rather less than that of Surrey, Sidney, and the Italians. Finally, Sh.'s indebtedness to Daniel was emphasized by SARRAZIN in his *Sh.'s Lehrjahre* (1897). The important parallels are duly noticed in the commentary in the present volume, and may be traced by reference to the index. But, as appears from remarks like Dowden's, in this case the alleged resemblance is not so much dependent on striking analogies in particular sonnets as on some general similarity of tone and style. Instances of similar phrasing, not of sufficient significance to be recorded in the notes, may nevertheless have a cumulative effect. Cf., for example, with 2, 2, *Delia* 4, 8: "Best in my face, where cares hath tilled deep furrows"; 3, 10 with *Delia* 29, 2: "The April of my years"; 5, 7–8 with *Delia* 37, 1–2:

> When Winter snows upon thy golden hairs,
> And frost of Age hath nipped thy flowers near;

24, 2 with *Delia* 13, 6–7:

> I figured on the table of my heart
> The goodliest shape that the world's eye admires;

* [The first portion of this section, concerning English sources, is based on a still unpublished paper by Miss RUTH KELSO, A. M., of the University of Illinois.— ED.]

and more of the same character. Of itself none of these parallels is especially striking. Time's furrows is a sufficiently familiar notion; cf., for instance, these lines from Turberville's *Epitaphs, Epigrams*, etc.:

> For crooked age his wonted trade is for to plough the face
> With wrinkled furrows, that before was chief of beauty's grace.

The conceit of the mistress's picture on the lover's heart is employed by Watson, Sidney, and Spenser, not to go further. The case is strengthened, however, by the general method of Daniel's treatment of one of Sh.'s principal themes, the quick decay of beauty and the consequent need of putting it to use; cf. *Delia* 35, cited in the notes on S. 1. Other themes common to both poets are the oppressiveness of night to the lover, and the eternizing power of verse; but these, again, were common also to the body of sonnet literature. In general, since many of the sonnets by Daniel which have been thought to resemble Sh.'s were published in 1591 and 1592, and since few critics would date Sh.'s as early, the hypothesis of Daniel's influence is not improbable.

In connection with his theory that the latter portion of Sh.'s sonnet collection is concerned with Penelope, Lady Rich, supposed to be Sidney's "Stella," MASSEY found reason to develop the subject of parallels between the Sonnets and Sidney's writings. He was followed in Germany by KRAUSS, who in the *Jahrbuch* for 1881 pointed out many such parallels. In Massey's later work (1888) Sh.'s indebtedness to Sidney was again made much of: "The earliest sonnets on marriage could not have been written until after Sh. had read the *Arcadia*"* (p. 71); "With S. 14 the likeness to or borrowing from [*Astrophel & Stella*] begins" (p. 74); see also pp. 248–51 (of *The Secret Drama*) for a comparison of the sonnets near the end of the collection with Sidney's. Again the more significant of Massey's parallels will be found in the commentary in this edition. This subject has attracted less discussion than the alleged influence of Daniel; but one of the most recent commentators, BRANDL, puts the case more strongly than any predecessor: "[Sidney] gave him, in *A. & S.*, the example of celebrating a lady with eyes of black — the opposite of beautiful, of writing of her as married, and of emphasizing her unhappy marital relations. . . . Sidney had already introduced the rôle of the friend who warns against illicit passion; Sh. took it over in such a manner as to be, in his own person, concerned about the beloved youth. Sidney had already opposed himself to rival poets, who flaunted 'new-found tropes' and 'strange similes,'

* Professor EDWIN GREENLAW has lately (*Studies in Philology*, 13: 135) called attention to the song of Geron, *Arcadia*, Book 1 (ed. 1590, f. 94 b), which he thinks "parallels the first seventeen sonnets of Sh. so closely as to render it practically certain that Sh. had it in mind." Cf. especially these lines:

> Nature above all things requireth this,
> That we our kind doo labour to maintaine;
> Which drawne-out line doth hold all humane blisse.
> Thy father justly may of thee complaine,
> If thou doo not repay his deeds for thee,
> In granting unto him a grandsires gaine.
> Thy common-wealth may rightly grieved be,
> Which must by this immortall be preserved,
> If thus thou murther thy posteritie.

while he would write only what appeared in reality; this was developed by Sh. to defence against a particular rival, who by such means approached his friend. Censors, guardian angels, old stories, the politics of the day, astrology, natural scenery, legal procedure, play a part in Sidney's verse, and in like manner with Sh.'s; the former speaks of his official duties as soldier and statesman, the latter of his calling as an actor; both enjoy enlarging upon their journeys and their observations while journeying; both glance at remoter objects but are finally led back, by clever turns, to the person beloved, even if these turns find expression in artificial or far-fetched form. Sidney had not been ashamed to confess a moral error, and the rhetoric of Sh. seeks to outdo him with self-reproaches; like Sidney, Sh. has employed his talents inadequately; and as Sidney in the end rejoices that by means of his troubles in love he has learned the difference between poison and true love, so Sh. finds content (110) in the fact that through his wanderings he has won a second youth of the heart. . . . Surely the appearance of the *Astrophel* sonnets in 1591 must have given the literary impulse for Sh.'s lyrical poetry." (Intro., pp. xxxii–iii.) Again, since the publication of Sidney's sonnets belongs to the same period as that of Daniel's earlier collections, it is plausible that Sh. should have studied the lyrical conceits of the one with those of the other.

A third inspirer of the Sonnets has been found in Drayton, notably by FLEAY, who in his *Biographical Chronicle* (1891) cited many parallels, and concluded: "[Sh.] has at least three corresponding passages with him for one with any other writer; and the likeness is much closer, especially in those parts of Drayton which are most removed from commonplace. It is impossible here to give full evidence; but any one who will saturate himself with Sh.'s Sonnets, and then read Drayton's, will find, as I have done, that hardly a stanza of Drayton has been left unused by Sh.; and as we cannot, from the manifest allusions in the sonnets of the latter, date them earlier than the Dedication to *Lucrece* (1594), which was printed in the same year as *Idea's Mirrour*, we are necessitated to reject the alternative hypothesis that Drayton may have copied Sh." (2: 230–31.) But TYLER had already (1890), while admitting some of the resemblances, observed that they were not to be found in the poems of Drayton as published in 1594, but appeared first in his volume of 1599; he therefore concluded that in the interval Drayton had made the acquaintance of Sh.'s Sonnets, — an acquaintance made not improbable by Meres's well-known remark as to their circulation. (Intro., pp. 39–42.) This argument was further developed by WYNDHAM (Poems, 1898, p. 256), who remarked on further imitations by Drayton in poems which first appeared as late as 1619 (but not without error here; cf. note on S. 116); and again by BEECHING (in a note appended to his edition, 1904), who argued that Drayton was an arch-imitator, having first written sonnets in the manner of Daniel, then in that of Sidney, then in that of Sh. (p. 133). Beeching's conclusion is: "If a poet at one time could write so like Daniel that his 'Clear Ankor, on whose silver-sanded shore' is as good and as characteristic of Daniel as any sonnet that charming writer ever produced, and at another time so not unlike Sidney that his 'My heart was

slain, and none but you and I' suggest at once the *A. & S.*, is it reasonable, when in turn we find him writing in the school of Sh., that he should be accounted Sh.'s master and not his pupil?" (p. 139.) LEE, on the other hand, supports the position of Fleay: "The whole of Drayton's century of sonnets, except twelve, were in print long before 1609, and it could easily be shown that the earlier 53, published in 1594, supply as close parallels with Sh.'s sonnets as any of the 47 published subsequently. Internal evidence suggests that all but one or two of Drayton's sonnets were written by him in 1594, in the full tide of the sonneteering craze. Almost all were doubtless in circulation in manuscript then. . . . Sh. would have had ready means of access to Drayton's manuscript collection." (*Life*, p. 110 n.) Finally, ELTON (*Michael Drayton*, 1905) views the matter as uncertain, but tends to support the position of Wyndham and Beeching, on the ground that "the passages in Drayton with that deeper sound, which we have learnt to call Shakespearean, hardly begin till his editions of 1599 or 1602. . . . It is natural to think that Drayton, glancing round after his assimilative fashion, early caught some deep accents and noble rhythms from Sh.'s poems, which he, like others, may have seen unprinted" (pp. 56–58). All which goes to show that in this instance, no matter what amount of parallelism is noted, inferences regarding borrowing are unsafe. The resemblances are in part, again, of the nature of current conceit-themes: identity of lover and friend, the madness of the lover, the supreme beauty of the beloved, the eternizing power of verse, and the like. In part they affect details of imagery and phrasing; for examples, see the index to the commentary as usual. With Sonnets 33–34 (to note one or two instances not mentioned in the notes) have been compared some lines from Drayton's S. 60:

> Behold the clouds which have eclipsed my sun!
> And view the crosses which my course do let!
> Tell me, if ever since the world begun
> So fair a rising had so foul a set?

The parallel may have interest, but surely little evidence of borrowing. With S. 107, much mooted for other reasons, has been compared Drayton's 51:

> Calling to mind since first my Love begun,
> The uncertain times, oft varying in their course;
> How things still unexpectedly have run,
> As it please the Fates, by their resistless force;
> Lastly, mine eyes amazedly have seen
> Essex's great fall, Tyrone his peace to gain,
> The quiet end of that long living Queen,
> This King's fair entrance, and our peace with Spain,
> We and the Dutch at length ourselves to sever;
> Thus the world doth and evermore shall reel:
> Yet to my goddess am I constant ever!

In case Sh.'s sonnet contains those allusions to contemporary events which many have supposed, the parallel is surely an interesting one; but the point in

the one case, even then, is different from that of the other. With S. 134, 7–11, a parallel has been found in Drayton's 3, 9–14:

> And thus mine eye a debtor to thine eye,
> Which by extortion gaineth all their looks;
> My heart hath paid such grievous usury,
> That all their wealth lies in thy Beauty's books.
> And all is thine which hath been due to me;
> And I a bankrupt, quite undone by thee.

But the abundant use of legal imagery in the various sonnet cycles deprives this analogy of any independent suggestiveness. Even more conventional is the representation of love as "frantic-mad," in S. 147, which has been compared with Drayton's S. 9: "I am lunatic!" — the playfulness of the latter being in strong contrast with the tone of Sh.'s. Of the analogies mentioned in the commentary, the most interesting are those found in Sonnets 46 (with Drayton's 33, on eye and heart), 116 (with Drayton's 43, on the plowman and the star), and 144 (with Drayton's 20, on the "evil spirit your beauty"). In all these cases the similarity of phrasing is decidedly suggestive, but see the notes, especially on the last two, for comment on its elusiveness. It is particularly odd that the "evil spirit" of Drayton should have been viewed as so conclusively related to Sh.'s "two loves"; in the one case the terms "angel" and "devil" are applied to the same person, in the other case to different persons, the former being a sufficiently familiar type of conceit, the latter a wholly novel situation.* Finally, we may note Drayton's S. 44, perhaps the most closely Shakespearean of them all, not so much in detailed phrasing as in general theme and style:

> Whilst thus my pen strives to eternize thee,
> Age rules my lines with wrinkles in my face;
> Where, in the map of all my misery,
> Is modeled out the world of my disgrace:
> Whilst in despite of tyrannizing times,
> Medea-like, I make thee young again,
> Proudly thou scorn'st my world-outwearing rhymes,
> And murder'st virtue with thy coy disdain.
> And though in youth my youth untimely perish,
> To keep thee from oblivion and the grave,
> Ensuing ages yet my rhymes shall cherish,
> Where I entomb'd my better part shall save;
> And though this earthly body fade and die,
> My name shall mount upon eternity.

* Still less reason is there to draw a parallel between Drayton's S. 10 and Sh.'s collection, as has been done on the ground that it appears to have been addressed to a young man ("To nothing fitter can I thee compare Than to the son of some rich penny-father"). There is not the slightest reason to suppose that it does not concern a woman, like all the others; the comparison with prodigal son is sufficiently explained by the fact that there is no such type as a prodigal daughter.

Other sonneteers than Drayton were introduced as sources for Sh. by LEE: "The thoughts and words of the sonnets of Daniel, Drayton, Watson, Barnabe Barnes, Constable, and Sidney were assimilated by Sh. in his poems as consciously and with as little compunction as the plays and novels of contemporaries in his dramatic work." (*Life*, p. 109.) Of these men, Lee's peculiar emphasis is laid on Barnes; thus, in his Introduction to *Elizabethan Sonnets* (1904) he observes, "Constantly [Barnes] strikes a note which Sh. clearly echoes in fuller tones." (1: lxxv–vi.) The use of conceits drawn from legal procedure, and of puns, are the chief specifications. (See the index, as usual, for particular passages.) But these, according to Lee's own argument, are among the practically universal conventions of the age; and it would be hard to find a sonnet style more different from Sh.'s, in general, than that of Barnes. No other critic finds him a plausible source.

The three sonnets which furnish suggestive parallels to Constable's verse are 24, 99, and 106 (see the notes for details). This is another instance where it is difficult to discriminate between conventional and individual elements; and it will be noted that in at least one sonnet (106) it has been argued that Constable is the borrower.

For an instance of possible borrowing from Giles Fletcher's *Licia* (1593), also noted by LEE, see notes on S. 153.

To Lee's list W. C. HAZLITT added the name of Barnfield, believing that it was the latter's *Affectionate Shepherd* (1594) which suggested to Sh. the writing of sonnets to a young man (*Sh., Himself & his Work*, ed. 1912).

Finally, a number of parallels have been noted for the Sonnets and Marlowe's *Hero & Leander*, especially by ISAAC in his article in the *Jahrbuch* for 1884. Isaac (see note on S. 4) was disposed to view Marlowe as the borrower, but ANDERS (*Sh.'s Books*, 1904, pp. 90–100) argues plausibly for Sh.'s indebtedness.*

Turning to the matter of foreign sources and analogues, we find, of course, very great difficulty in disentangling the matter of special influences from the general question of the Renaissance lyric. ISAAC, for example, in his articles in Herrig's *Archiv* for 1879 and the *Jahrbücher* of 1882 and 1884, makes much of the Italian elements in what he takes to be Sh.'s earlier sonnets, with special emphasis on Petrarch and Tasso, but without exact consideration of the evidences respecting Sh.'s probable acquaintance with the Italian sonnets. In recent times Sir SIDNEY LEE has become the chief authority in this field, and has emphasized the influence of the French, but again with some vagueness as to the matter of direct and indirect sources for Sh. The conceits of the Renaissance lyric, he tells us, "figure in Sh.'s pages clad in the identical livery that clothed them in the sonnets of Petrarch, Ronsard, De Baif, and Desportes, or of English disciples of the Italian and French masters. . . . Such resemblances as are visible between Sh.'s sonnets and those of Petrarch or Desportes seem due to his study of the English imitators of those sonneteers. Most of Ronsard's 900 sonnets and many of his numerous odes were accessible to Sh.

* In general Anders explicitly slights the subject of the sources of the Sonnets.

in English adaptations, but there are a few signs that Sh. had recourse to Ronsard direct." (*Life*, pp. 110–11.) In his work on *The French Renaissance in England* Lee recurs to the subject: "In Sh.'s sonnets no instances of exact translation or direct imitation [of the poetry of the Pléiade] appear. But thought and expression occasionally resemble French effort closely enough to suggest that the processes of assimilation wrought at times on Sh.'s triumphant achievement in much the same way as on the mass of the sonneteering efforts of his day. Constantly Sh. seems to develop with magnificent power and melody a familiar theme of foreign suggestion." (p. 266.) Special themes of this character are the urging of youthful beauty to propagate itself, the praise of patrons, the denunciation of false mistresses, and the poetic vaunt of immortality. In addition to the various passages cited in the commentary from Lee, he notes (as a parallel for S. 104) a sonnet by Vauquelin de la Fresnaie:

> La terre ia trois fois s'est desaisie
> De sa verdure, et ia de leurs vertus
> Se sont trois fois les arbres devêtus,
> Depuis qu'à toi s'est mon âme asservie;

again, on the theme of "unthrifty loveliness," a sonnet by Amadis Jamyn:

> Si la beauté périst, ne l'esparge, maistresse,
> Tandis qu'elle fleurist en sa jeune vigueur;
> Crois moi, je te supply, devant que la vieillesse
> Te sillonne le front, fais plaisir de ta fleur;

and again, in praise of a patron, a sonnet by Etienne Jodelle:

> Combien que veu ton sang, ton rang, ton abondance,
> Serviteur je te sois: j'ose prendre envers toy
> Un nom plus haut, plus digne, et plus grand, puis qu'à moy
> Tu daignes t'abaissant en donner la puissance.
> Je suis donc ton ami, mais tel que l'excellence
> Du beau mot n'orgueillit mon devoir ny ma foy:
> Car plus que mille serfs je puis ce que je doy
> Payer, et croy qu'amour doit toute obeissance.

For the vituperative sonnets of Jodelle, see the notes on Sonnets 127 and 147. For the theme of poetic immortality, both Ronsard and Du Bellay furnish notable parallels, as may be traced through the index to the commentary. On the other hand, for some observations as to the contrast between Sh.'s use of these themes and that characteristic of his predecessors, too little remarked by Lee, one should compare the essay of E. S. Bates, a part of which is quoted above under General Criticism.

Lee's theory of the close relationship between the sonnets of Sh. and those of the Renaissance lyrists of the continent receives notable support in the recent article by Wolff (*Englische Studien*, 49: 161) on the evidence to be drawn from a study of Petrarchism in Italy. In Wolff's view there is hardly a characteristic theme of the Sonnets which was not conventionally familiar in the

period. Particular analogies of interest are the following: the glorifying of the object of the poet's love as a type of all beauty; the want of distinction between male and female beauty, and between love directed toward one of the same sex and that directed toward one of the opposite sex, — with a tendency, however, to preference for the former, as being free from ordinary physical passion; the praise of manly beauty in terms commonly associated with womanly charms, notably fair skin and blond hair; the doctrine that it is the part of beauty to propagate itself; the willingness to demean one's self before a patron even to the point of self-contempt and self-accusation; the fashion of depreciating one's own poetry in comparison with that of rivals; the attitude of melancholy, with scorn of life and desire for death; the disposition, in other moods, to rebel against the conventional standards, and to celebrate persons of both dark beauty and doubtful morals; the portrayal of a conflict between loves of opposite character; the recognition of rivalry in love, with a tendency to forgive and even to yield to the rival. Particular instances cited in connection with some of these themes may also be noted. "Michelangelo calls Vittoria Colonna, for her greater honor, *grande amico*, and interprets it as her highest praise that she is *uomo in una donna*." "Tasso writes to . . . Leonora Sanvitale, that no artist would be able to preserve her likeness, but only she herself through the birth of a son. . . . He warns the beautiful Duke of Joyeuse not to fall in love with himself, like Narcissus, as Bernardo Capello admonishes his beloved that God had not given her beauty that she should hide it within herself." "Annibal Caro is so wholly submissive to the will of his lord, that he wishes nothing, thinks nothing, is nothing, apart from him." "Sannazaro speaks of his *stato indigno*, Giovanni Guidiccione of his *misero stato*, G. Stampa represents himself as *brutta e vile*, Mezzabarba as rough and common, and Philoxeno (in a strambotto) as *turpe e streno*." "Bembo is so dazzled with the splendor of his lord, that he can find no words. Angelo di Costanzo on the other hand rebukes the *pigro sonno* of his Muse, which has hindered him from fulfilling his duty, and Tansillo is dumb because so many other poets pay homage to his patron." "Della Casa praises the young Antonio Soranzo as his sole light and comfort, and Christoforo Madruzio as the last virtuous soul in the ruined world; Bembo calls Trifon Gabriele a surviving evidence of the golden age; the patron of Sannazaro is the triumphant renewer of a former time; and Galeazzo do Tarsia announces that with his Prospero beauty was brought to birth and done away." Molza "finds all the splendor of the world united in Ippolito de' Medeci, to whom his spirit wholly belongs and follows as a shadow." "Bernardo Tasso is consumed with passion for a youth without whom he cannot live and wishes to die, . . . as Francesco Coppetta prays his friend that he will restore the sun of his eyes and illumine his night." "Angelo di Costanzo calls his style poor and weak, and, like Sh., prefers to be silent rather than to injure the glory of his patron by his words. . . . Molza recognizes the defects of his art, which can only be raised through his splendid subject-matter, the worth of his lord." "Bembo places the art of Trissino high above his own; della Casa calls himself a common water-fowl, Bembo a swan in contrast. . . .

In the same way Angelo di Costanzo sets his incapacity over against the magnificence of Antonio Carafa." Berni's beloved has "silver hair, black brows, white lips, and so on; and in *Petrarchista* the pilgrim returned from Vaucluse relates that he had been shown the picture of Laura, but had been able to discover nothing of its wonders — neither snow, nor roses, nor gold." "Polizian pays homage to his *Brunettina*, Tasso calls Leonore Sanvitale *bruna, ma bella*, and in a sonnet to Giulia Negri he plays with the words *negra* and *alba*. . . . The mistresses of Mezzabarba and Alamanni have dark hair." "Tasso declares flatly that his mistress is not beautiful, that her hair is not golden; . . . he deplores her inconstancy and knows that she scorns him; but her scorn and her hate appear to him better than the kindness of others." Alamanni "asserts sadly that he and his friend love the same lady. Then it runs: Inconstant, not to say faithless, sweet friend, why wilt thou destroy the old nest of my thoughts? In the same way he bewails in a madrigal the treachery of the friend." Finally, there are narratives of the period, notably a play called *Erofilomachia* or *Duello d'Amore e d'Amicitia*, in which one friend turns over to another the lady whom he loves; in the prologue to this *Duello* it is pointed out how noble it is to possess so lofty a soul as to prefer friendship to one's own desires. All this (with more, of course, not represented here) surely forms an impressive support for those who emphasize the conventional interpretation of the Sonnets of Sh., even if one does not go so far as to accept Wolff's conclusion that they give us "practically nothing" on the life of the author, except what concerns his life as an artist. Wolff does not assume a direct borrowing by Sh. from the Italians, but rather through the French poets, who must be further studied along the line of investigation already begun by Lee.

Many of these continental influences are, of course, ultimately platonic. The more definitely platonic and neo-platonic elements in the Sonnets were first discussed in detail by SIMPSON, in his interesting essay on *The Philosophy of Sh.'s Sonnets* (1868); see his notes on Sonnets 1, 22, 31, etc. ISAAC followed, in Germany, with a section on "Sh. and Plato" in his article in Herrig's *Archiv*, 1879, in which he described the platonic academies of the Italian Renaissance. More eccentrically, but with no little learning, the nameless author of the articles on "New Views of Sh.'s Sonnets" in *Blackwood's Magazine*, 1884–86, represented Sh. as a devout student of Dante, and also noted a number of Elizabethan media for the influence of medieval mysticism. WYNDHAM, in his edition of the Poems (1898), newly emphasized the platonic elements in the Sonnets (see especially his note on S. 37, 10), comparing them with those in Spenser's "Hymn in Honour of Beautie." "Mr. Walter Raleigh," he says, "has pointed out to me that Spenser and Sh. must have been familiar with Hoby's translation of Baldassare Castiglione's *Il Cortegiano*, published in 1561. . . . Plato's theory of Beauty had been ferried long before from Byzantium to Florence, and had there taken root. . . . And from Italy young noblemen, accredited to Italian courts or traveling for their pleasure, had brought its influence to France and England. . . . Sh. must have read Spenser's *Hymn* and Hoby's *Courtier*, in which Plato, Socrates, and Plotinus are all instanced;

the phrase — *genio Socratem* — applied to him in the epitaph on his monument attests his fondness for Platonic theories, and in the Sonnets he addressed a little audience equally conversant with them; it is, therefore, not surprising that he should have borrowed their terminology. In some sonnets he does so, but the Sonnets are not, therefore, as some have argued, an exposition of Plato's theory or of its Florentine developments. Sh. in certain passages does but lay under contribution the philosophy of his time, just as, in other passages, he lays under contribution the art and occupations of his time." (Intro., pp. cxix–cxxii.) The same subject is discussed by BRANDES, in his *William Sh.* (1898; 1: 341–49). TYLER, in his edition of the Sonnets (1890), emphasizes rather the mysticism of Giordano Bruno, believing that Sh. may have derived from him the doctrine of "the soul of the world" and the doctrine of "cycles"; see comment on this doubtful conjecture in the notes on Sonnets 59 and 107. All the Renaissance influences, both poetic and philosophic, are considered, with some analysis of the leading poetic themes connected therewith, in KLEIN'S article on "Foreign Influence in Sh.'s Sonnets" in the *Sewanee Review*, 1905.

Of classical sources the only notable name which has been instanced, aside from Plato's, is that of Ovid.* For this the chief authority is LEE'S article in the *Quarterly Review*, 1909, where the special influence on Sh. of Golding's translation is emphasized. See the index, as usual, for particular references.† Certain of the philosophic themes which by others have been referred to the neo-platonists, such as the doctrine of "cycles," are shown by Lee to be explicable by reference to Ovid alone. Since Sh., he observes, "was no professed metaphysician," we may explain his use of these philosophic subtleties by the digression in the last book of the *Metamorphoses*. "A poetic master's interpretation of Life and Eternity involuntarily claimed the respectful attention of a loyal disciple" (p. 466). Again: "Some of the ideas common to Ovid and Sh. are the universal food of poetry. . . . [Sh.] by no means stood alone among Elizabethan poets in assimilating Ovid's Neo-Pythagorean doctrine. Nor is the cyclical solution of Nature's mysteries the exclusive property of Ovid, or of his Neo-Pythagorean tutors; it is shared by the Stoics and the Neo-Platonists. But the poets of Europe first learnt its outlines in Ovid's pages, even if curiosity impelled some of them subsequently to supplement Ovid's information by resort to metaphysical treatises of one or other of the Greek schools and to current Italian adaptations of Neo-Pythagoreanism or Neo-Platonism" (p. 474).

Though Lee gives evidence in this essay, as commonly when source-hunting,

* But note also the (originally) Greek source of Sonnets 153–154; see the commentary thereon. J. C. COLLINS instances this as evidence of Sh.'s classical scholarship, in his article, "Had Sh. Read the Greek Tragedies?" (*Fortnightly Review*, n.s., 73: 848); and some of the Baconians, *per contra*, have offered it as proof that the Sonnets cannot be the work of the ignoramus of Stratford-on-Avon.

† VON MAUNTZ, in his commentary on the Sonnets, also provides many of these references, especially to the *Amores* and other elegies; but these are to be understood not as suggesting the source of Sh.'s thought so much as the analogous treatment of similar themes — particularly that of *odi et amo*. On the other hand, Sh.'s familiarity with Marlowe's version of the *Amores* may be fairly assumed.

of magnifying beyond reason the theme of the moment, no reader will quarrel with his final comment, nor question its appropriateness to this whole discussion of Sh.'s sources: "Critical lovers of the Sonnets, who recognise in them the flower of poetic fervour, will probably be content to draw, from the fact of Sh.'s absorption of the Ovidian philosophy, fresh evidence of that miraculous sympathy and receptivity whereby

> all the learnings that his time
> Could make him the receiver of, . . . he took,
> As we do air, fast as 't was ministered,
> And in 's spring became a harvest."

THE FRIEND*

THE commentary on the Dedication sets forth the various interpretations of it as a sentence, and of the meaning of the word "begetter." The sentence has, for the most part, been understood to mean that Thorpe wished "Mr. W. H." happiness and "eternity"; the word "begetter" has been rendered both as "inspirer" and as "procurer." Because of the importance of the Dedication in influencing theories concerning the friend to whom many — if not most — of the Sonnets were addressed, it may be taken as a basis for a classification of those who have written on the subject of this friend's identity. Three groups may be roughly distinguished.

1. Those who comprise the first group make much of the Dedication. They believe that Mr. W. H. and the young man whom Sh. sonnetized are identical, and that, with the initials as a hint, we can put our finger upon the individual. Some find him in William Herbert, Earl of Pembroke; others present such varied names as William Harte, William Hughes, William Hammond, William Hall, and (mystically understood) William Himself; still others propose William Shakespeare, regarding "H" as a misprint for "S"; and others, finally, Henry Wriothesley, Earl of Southampton, viewing the initials as reversed as a blind. All these interpret "begetter" as "inspirer."

2. The critics in the second group do not attach so much importance to the Dedication. "Mr. W. H." may offer corroborative evidence as to the identity of the friend, but is not himself the friend. Characteristic of this group are those who find the friend in Southampton, but take Mr. W. H. to be a mere "procurer," — William Hall, a stationer's assistant; or William Hathaway, Sh.'s brother-in-law; or Sir William Hervey, who married Southampton's mother.

3. The third body of students find even less to influence them in the Dedication than do those belonging to the second group. They adopt varying positions, some avoiding the search for a friend by means of such theories as that the Sonnets are an allegory or that they are a work of fiction, others admitting his existence but holding that there is no evidence warranting speculation as to his identity.

Having indicated these general positions, we may proceed to consider the evidence brought forward by the members of the first and second groups just described.

I. THE PEMBROKE THEORY

This theory was proposed by BRIGHT (1819) and BOADEN (1832), and reached its height in TYLER'S presentation (1890). Since then, the attacks of LEE, BEECHING, and others have somewhat weakened it. As the arguments for Pem-

* [This section was prepared by Mr. FRANK E. HILL, A.M. — ED.]

broke as the friend, and for his chief rival Southampton, have been widely scattered, and frequently veiled under misleading verbiage, it seems worth while to set down in compact and definite form the principal evidence offered for and against both these hypotheses. In the following outlines, sources and authorities are briefly indicated where it is practicable to do so; — usually the originator of the argument or objection in question, sometimes the one who has first developed a long standing but apparently negligible idea into something worthy of consideration. Fuller references to these sources can be traced in the Bibliography.*

Arguments for Pembroke	*Objections to Pembroke*
I. The Dedication offers evidence that the friend's initials were W. H., since he is spoken of as the "begetter" or inspirer of the Sonnets (BOADEN, DOWDEN); he is also wished the "eternity" which Sh. had promised him.	I. The Dedication offers no evidence that the friend's initials were W. H., for "begetter" means procurer (DRAKE); while "eternity" could not appropriately be wished to the friend, who was already assured of *his* eternity through the praise of an "ever-living poet."
II. Sonnets 135, 136, and 143 indicate that the friend's name is "Will," as more than one person of that name is implied (DOWDEN).	II. The "Will" sonnets do not refer to more than one person of the name, but play upon the name of Sh. and the common meanings "determination" and "desire" (LEE).
III. Pembroke fits the requirements of the name, for he was known as William Herbert until 1601 (BOADEN). The "Mr." is not a bar, for Thorpe may have found "W. H." on the MS. and have added the "Mr." (DOWDEN), or he may have added it as a disguise (ARCHER).	III. Pembroke does not fit the requirements of the name, for he was known as Lord Herbert to 1601, and Earl of Pembroke thereafter; to address him as "Mr." would have been a star-chamber offence (STOPES, LEE). Moreover, Thorpe's dedication to Pembroke in 1616 shows that he gave full titles in addressing nobility (STOPES).
IV. Both Sonnets and Dedication suggest that the friend is a nobleman. S. 37 speaks of "birth" and "wealth" (TYLER); 36 of "public kindness" and "honour" (BOADEN); 49, 69, 70, 71, 72, 95, 96 in a general way, and 78, 79, 80, 85, 86 in connection with the homage of poets, indicate prominence of station (BOADEN, TYLER). The tone of the Dedication also implies some social standing (BEECHING).	IV. Nobility is not implied by either Sonnets or Dedication, the most that can be inferred being a position socially higher than an actor or printer (BUTLER, BEECHING). Pronouns of address, and other evidences of intimacy on equal terms, make a noble station very improbable (JUSSERAND, GRAY).
V. Pembroke's age fits the demands of the Sonnets, for the evidence points to a date of composition running from 1598 to 1601. Pembroke was 18 in 1598, and is known to have been urged to marry in 1597–98 (TYLER). His being	V. The evidence points to a date, or dates, between 1593 and 1596, with special probability attaching to the time when the sonnet vogue was at its height, viz., about 1594. At this time Pembroke was but 14. On the other

* See also in the section on the Date of Composition, pp. 441–52 above, an outline of the significant details in the lives of Southampton and Pembroke.

Sh.'s junior by 16 years also corresponds to the language of a number of the Sonnets.

VI. Pembroke's person corresponds with the youth of the Sonnets, for Anthony à Wood and Clarendon testify to his impressive appearance in later years, and a poem of Davison's (1602) notes his "outward shape" as being "most lovely" (TYLER).

VII. Pembroke's character corresponds with that of the youth of the Sonnets, for he was both sensual and a lover of poets (BOADEN, TYLER).

VIII. Heminge and Condell dedicated the Folio plays to Pembroke (and his brother) in 1623, and mentioned his having "prosecuted both them, and their author living, with so much favour" (BOADEN).

IX. Pembroke's connection with the "dark lady" is indicated by the evidence, for he had illicit relations with Mary Fitton, maid of honor to the Queen, whose character corresponds closely with that of Sh.'s mistress; Will Kemp's dedication to her of his *Nine Daies Wonder* also suggests acquaintance between her and Sh. (TYLER). The dark lady of a number of the plays also corresponds with Mrs. Fitton (HARRIS).

hand, Southampton came of age and was still unmarried in 1594 (LEE).

VI. Wood's and Clarendon's descriptions give no impression of beauty, and Davison's tribute is a cautious qualification (LEE). Pembroke's hair, too, was dark, whereas that of the hero of the Sonnets is compared with reddish buds of marjoram (STOPES).

VII. Southampton's character fits the case at least as well (see arguments for Southampton).

VIII. The Folio dedication has little weight, being purely formal; and Pembroke, being Lord Chamberlain at the time, was the only logical choice (LEE).

IX. Pembroke's mistress cannot be identified with the "dark lady." S. 152 indicates that the latter was married, and Mrs. Fitton had not been married at the time in question (cf. Chambers, *Academy*, July 31, 1897); moreover, Mary Fitton seems not to have been dark (cf. BRIDGEMAN, in appendix to Lady Newdigate-Newdegate's *Gossip from a Muniment Room*, 2d ed.; LEE; BEECHING). Kemp's dedication, so far from indicating intimacy with Mrs. Fitton, mistakes her Christian name (LEE).

The negative evidence here appears to be at least as strong as the positive. At best, the case for Pembroke rests upon a purely inferential kind of circumstantial evidence, and practically no part of it remains unassailed. It is noteworthy that it depends, first of all, upon a relatively late date for the composition of the Sonnets. If this be accepted, the disparity of years between Sh. and Pembroke is favorable to the claim of the latter; and the Folio dedication makes it at least possible that Sh., after 1594, changed patrons. But this claim is weakened, rather than strengthened, by its connection with the Mary Fitton theory, which may be said to have been disproved. Tyler's argument for this goes far to upset itself. The lady is introduced in order to strengthen Pembroke's claim to be called the friend. Now if we could point to a woman who was both Sh.'s mistress and Pembroke's mistress, we might agree that Pembroke's claim was strengthened, though even then it might be argued that, when the woman in the case is called "the bay where all men ride," there is room for much uncertainty. Tyler, however, does not provide the least we could expect as proof, — namely, that Mrs. Fitton *was* both Sh.'s and

Pembroke's mistress. He does show that she was Pembroke's, and attempts (without great success) to show that her character matches that of the siren of the poems. Then, forgetting that he had called forth Mrs. Fitton in order to prove Pembroke the friend, and feeling — what is true — that before she can be of use to him she must be definitely proved the "dark lady," he alleges that, *because* Pembroke was the friend, therefore his mistress was Sh.'s mistress (the friend might have had more than one, but let us pass that), therefore she was the "dark lady." Pembroke, therefore (finally), was the friend!

II. The Southampton Theory

This theory, since its proposal by Drake (1817), has maintained a brave front with the exception of the period 1890–1898, when it seemed likely that Tyler would establish the claims of Pembroke. Lee's *Life of Sh.* (1898) gave new life to Drake's hypothesis, which has all along had more advocates in Germany, if not in England, than the Pembroke theory. The principal arguments may be outlined as follows:

Arguments for Southampton

I. General evidence favors a date of composition, for the Sonnets, of about 1594, the height of the sonnet vogue; and at this period Southampton was Sh.'s avowed patron (cf. dedications to *V. & A.* and *Lucrece*); indeed there is no evidence pointing to any other (Drake, Lee).

II. The Sonnets give evidence of being addressed to a patron, for they are conventional in form, in their use of the theme of immortality, etc. Some twenty of them are dedicatory in nature, and Sonnets 26, 32, 38 express in verse the prose sentiments of the *Lucrece* dedication (Drake, Lee).

III. There is also evidence of a warmer relationship between the two men than that of poet and patron, for Anthony à Wood speaks of Southampton's generosity to Sh., and Sh., in the dedication of *Lucrece*, tells of the "love without end" which he bears his patron, and assures him that "what I have is yours" (Drake, Lee).

V. Southampton's age and situation are appropriate for the friend of the Sonnets, for in 1594 he was 21, and was still unmarried (Lee); moreover, his father had died when he was a child, a circumstance corresponding

Arguments against Southampton

I. It is very doubtful whether most of the Sonnets were written as early as 1594 (Beeching, etc.; see under Date); and there is no evidence that Southampton's patronage continued throughout the later period. In 1598–1603 the Sonnets could hardly have been addressed to Southampton (Boaden, Tyler).

II. There is no certainty that the Sonnets celebrate a patron; their conventionality has been exaggerated, and the "dedicatory sonnets" are not necessarily dedicatory at all (Beeching). Sonnets 26, etc., no more repeat the *Lucrece* dedication than do many sonnets by other poets of the time (Archer).

III. Wood's note is based on mere hearsay, and if true denotes no more than admiring generosity; and the "love" of the dedications is a conventional term for poet to use toward patron, as Lee himself shows (Archer). Moreover, S. 125 may be Sh.'s protestation that his attentions to Southampton were formal and temporary (Tyler).

IV. Southampton's age was too advanced for the probable date of the Sonnets (see I above); and it is highly improbable that Sh. should ever have addressed him as "sweet boy" (Beeching). The language of S. 13

to "You *had* a father" of S. 13. The argument that he was not enough younger than Sh. to explain the language of the Sonnets is not valid, for his youthful "prime" at 24 might well make a man of 33 feel old by comparison (LEE). Poets are known, too, to have spoken of men of 30 as "boys" in Elizabeth's time.

has no bearing on the question, since the past tense does not imply that the father was dead (TYLER). The sixteen years' difference between Pembroke and Sh. are far more appropriate to the conditions (BOADEN, ARCHER).

V. Southampton's personal appearance corresponds with that of the youth of the Sonnets, for he was "acclaimed the handsomest of Elizabethan courtiers" (LEE); his portraits also show him to have been handsome, and to have had light auburn hair, suggestive of the comparison with "buds of marjoram" (STOPES, LEE).

V. It is more than doubtful whether Southampton's portraits reveal a handsome man; and if the Sonnets date from 1598 and later, his age makes the depicted youthful beauty improbable (BOADEN).

VI. Southampton's character corresponds with that of the friend, for he was one of the dissipated courtiers of the time, and was beloved of poets (LEE).

VI. Southampton's character does not correspond with that of the friend; he bore no such reputation for sensuality as Pembroke, could not well be called "lovely" (but was rather distinguished as tempestuous and quarrelsome), and was primarily a soldier — a circumstance of which the Sonnets give no hint (BOADEN, ARCHER).

VII. Southampton's release from prison on the accession of James I appears to be alluded to in S. 107 (LEE).

VII. The date of S. 107 is quite uncertain, and it cannot be naturally explained as a congratulatory address to Southampton (BEECHING).

VIII. The fact that Southampton's initials were H. W. does not conflict with his claim; for the W. H. of the Dedication may not refer to the subject of the Sonnets; or, if it does, the initials may have been reversed as a blind. On the other hand, if the W. S. of *Willobie his Avisa* is Sh., Southampton's claim is confirmed by the use, in that poem, of the initials H. W. (FLEAY, ACHESON).

VIII. Southampton's claim is made impossible by the fact that his name was Henry (see I and II under the arguments for Pembroke). As to *Willobie his Avisa*, there is no real evidence for connecting it with Sh.; nor, if the W. S. of the poem were Sh., would there be any reason for taking the Henry Willobie of the poem to be Henry Wriothesley. (See below, pp. 478–82.)

(To these are to be added the arguments on both sides respecting the question whether the friend was a nobleman, as noted under the Pembroke theory, IV.)

On reviewing these arguments, it becomes evident that the cause of Southampton depends upon the known patronage which that earl extended to Sh., associated with a belief in the comparatively early date of the Sonnets. The evidence respecting Southampton's personal beauty is perhaps balanced by the comparative inappropriateness of his age and reputation. Throughout, as with the Pembroke theory, plausible objections are raised at every step, and the whole body of evidence is seen to be circumstantial and inferential.

III. Other Theories

The name of William Harte was suggested by Farmer in Malone's edition of 1780. Harte was Sh.'s nephew, the son of his sister Joan. Since he was not baptized until August 28, 1600, after most of the sonnets had — in all probability — been written, this view has gained no supporters.

William Hughes, a name rather than an individual, was proposed by Tyrwhitt, also in Malone's edition of 1780, on the basis of the italicised "Hews" of Sonnet 20. See the notes on that sonnet for the further development of this theory. It finds no important supporters in recent criticism. Mackail has observed humorously that, if we once undertake to use typographical details as a means of identification, William Rose should be our choice rather than Hews or Hughes, since the word "rose" is capitalized no less than ten times in the text of the Sonnets, and appears in the first sonnet in startling italics.

William Hammond was proposed by W. C. Hazlitt (1874), but this notion has attracted little evidence and no supporters.

Mrs. Stopes has suggested William Herbert (1890), — not the Earl of Pembroke, but a private person; and again, William Hunnis, a minor poet; but has since withdrawn these names, and supports Southampton as the friend, with Sir William Hervey (or Harvey) as "begetter" in another sense.

William Hall (not the stationer of Lee's "begetter" theory, but a member of a Worcestershire family) was proposed by Underhill (see the Bibliography under V, 1890).

Last of the theories based on the initials of the Dedication, we may note that of F. A. White (see Bibliography, V, 1900), who finds the friend to be William Hathaway, junior, son of Sh.'s brother-in-law and a former sweetheart (hypothetically) named Susan Hamnet!

Of conjectures not based on the Dedication, the earliest is that of Chalmers (1797), that the Sonnets were addressed to Queen Elizabeth. Travers (1880) proposed the view that they were addressed to an illegitimate son of the poet's. (See note on S. 36.) The only theory of this sort (outside that of the Southamptonists) offered by a critic deserving of attention is that of Isaac, who in 1884 proposed the Earl of Essex. His main contentions are (1) that the sonnets bear evidence of a very early date of composition, the late 80's or early 90's; (2) that Essex, in both character, beauty, and situation, resembles the friend of the Sonnets. Stress is laid upon the young earl's beauty, and upon the probability that such an experience as the dark-lady sonnets represent is one likely to be gone through by a young man, inexperienced and imaginative, rather than by one at the height of fame and knowledge of the world. The theory has found few adherents, most critics doubtless feeling that the date of the Sonnets on which it rests is improbable, and that, since Essex was born in 1566, the want of disparity in age between him and Sh. makes his identification with the "lovely youth" out of the question.

All these theories remaining mere hypotheses, there remains the view that to refuse to accept what is unproved is more satisfying, after all, than to try to

support what cannot be demonstrated. Could we produce an Elizabethan whose initials were W. H., whose birth was gentle, whose position was fairly eminent, who was born about 1576 (and hence could have been urged to marry as early as 1594 or as late as 1598), who was lovely to look upon, sensual, capricious, charming, who was known to have loved a woman — a brunette, clever, and indiscreet, who both loved and patronized Sh.; — if we could produce such a person, we might reconcile some, even, of the Pembrokists and Southamptonists, and win not a few skeptics to the view that the identity of the friend is demonstrable. For, as Professor GRAY observes, "There is something sad about working over a vexed problem and getting in the end only negative results. One so *wishes* to say 'Southampton' or 'Pembroke,' or even, in desperation, 'William Hughes'!" But the paragon has not been produced; the evidence for all the "friends" seems, in the view of the most cautious critics, to be conjectural merely; as Gray puts it, again, "Southampton and Pembroke can play each other to a tie, but neither can show any compelling reason for the choice of him." One may admire, then, the more daring critic who will accept suggestive evidence rather than have no theory at all; but one must also try to retain a sense of the difference between conjecture and proof.

The following table, while making no pretension to completeness, will give the reader some idea of the position of the critics on the question of the identity of the friend of the Sonnets.

Pembroke Theory		*Southampton Theory*		*Other Theories*	
				Tyrwhitt and Malone (William Hughes)	1780
		Drake	1817		
Bright	1819				
		Mrs. Jameson	1829		
Boaden	1832				
Hunter	1845				
		Cartwright	1859		
		Jordan	1861		
Alger	1862	Gervinus	1862		
		Corney	1862		
		Kreyssig	1863	W. C. Hazlitt (William Hammond)	1865
		Massey	1866		
		Sievers	1866		
		Chasles	1867		
		Krauss	1872		
Minto	1874				
				Furnivall (agnostic)	1877
W. Rossetti	1878				
Main	1880				
		Stengel	1881	Dowden (agnostic)	1881
Mackay	1884			Isaac (Essex)	1884
Sharp	1885				
Tyler	1886	Fleay	1886		
Verity	1890				
Shindler	1892				

		von Mauntz	1894		
		Sarrazin	1895		
Boas	1896				
Archer	1897				
Brandes	1898	Sidney Lee	1898		
		Stopes	1898	Butler (William Hughes)	1899
		Herford	1900		
		Henry	1900		
		Acheson	1903		
				Beeching (agnostic)	1904
Rolfe	1905	Genée	1905		
				Luce (agnostic)	1906
				Walsh (agnostic)	1908
Harris	1909			Jusserand (agnostic)	1909
				Mackail (agnostic)	1911
				Porter (agnostic)	1912
		Brandl	1913		

THE RIVAL POET*

THE sonnets which give rise to the problem of the "rival poet" are those numbered 78 to 86 (excluding 81). Some critics have found allusions in other sonnets, but the basis of identification rests in these. The elements of it are as follows. In S. 78 is a reference to "every alien pen." If the lines that follow are to be referred primarily to the one poet who in other sonnets is singled out as rival, he is more "learned" than Sh. (78, 7), and has "grace" (78, 8). His writing is "polished" (85, 8), and is spoken of as "precious phrase by all the Muses filed" (85, 4). From the expression "fresher stamp of the time-bettering days" (82, 8), it has been inferred that he was a younger man than Sh. In spite of this, his is a "worthier pen" (79, 6), and a "better spirit" (80, 2). The "proud full sail of his great verse" (86, 1) is discouraging to others. Sh. speaks of himself as "tongue-tied" (80, 4) in his presence, and of his own bark as "a worthless boat" (80, 11) in comparison with the rival's, "of tall building and of goodly pride." (For the more or less conventional character of such passages, see the evidence given by WOLFF, page 460 above.) The unknown is also distinguished by the fact that he writes "hymns" (85, 7), and that he "spends all his might" (80, 3) in praise of the patron. In other passages he is treated with rather less respect. His rhetoric is called "strained" (82, 10) and "gross painting" (82, 13), in comparison with simple truth, — though this is rather by way of praise of the patron than of derogation from the rival's art. Most mysteriously, he is said to be "taught to write" by "spirits" (86, 5), to be aided by "compeers by night" (86, 7), and to be "gulled" nightly by an "affable familiar ghost" (86, 9).

All this assumes that but one poet is referred to in these sonnets, after the general introductory allusion to "every alien pen." Some critics, however, find evidence of two (see notes on 83, 14); and some — notably MASSEY, FLEAY, and WYNDHAM — of a number. We may also note one or two other minor theories. STRONACH (*N. & Q.*, 9th s., 12: 141, 273), viewing the sonnet collection as a miscellany like the *Passionate Pilgrim*, finds that among the poems included are some by Barnabe Barnes, in which Sh. is the subject and not the author of the rival-poet allusions. In like manner MACKAY (*Nineteenth Century*, 1884) finds that the sonnets in question are the work of Marlowe. Here may also be mentioned the theories according to which Dante and Tasso, respectively, are proposed as rival poet, the first by an anonymous contributor in *Blackwood's Magazine* for 1884–86, the second by LEIGH, in the *Westminster Review* for 1897. In both cases the evidence is far-fetched and entirely negligible.

For the great body of critics the question centers about the identification of a single poet, a contemporary of Sh., and one who might in some sense be thought

* [This section is based on an unpublished paper by Mr. WILLIAM T. HAM, A.M. — ED.]

to be a rival for the patronage naturally sought by a man of letters of the time. Spenser, naturally enough, was the first to be suggested, by MALONE; as WALSH observes, he was "the only 'better spirit' at the time whose competition Sh. need have feared." No critic, however, has found any historical evidence to support this view, and the claim has met with general skepticism. BOADEN points out that for the Pembrokists Spenser is impossible, since he died too young (1599) to dedicate to that nobleman. Not much is gained for the Spenser theory by the support of GERTRUDE GARRIGUES, who (in an article in the *Journal of Speculative Philosophy*, 1887), viewing the Sonnets as mystical in character, argues that Sh. realized that he would never be able to attain the philosophic heights of Spenser, or that of J. E. G. DE MONTMORENCY, who (in the *Contemporary Review*, 1912) also views Sh. as a follower of Spenser in the field of allegory.

The claims of Marlowe also received early attention, and were supported most elaborately by MASSEY. Massey believed, to be sure, that Nash was the "learned" poet of S. 78, but that Marlowe was he with "a double majesty" of "grace." (See note on 78, 8.) In the use of the word "Arts" (78, 12) he finds an allusion to Marlowe's degree of M.A., and the supernatural details of S. 86 are explained by his interest in necromancy and by *Faustus*. As Marlowe died in 1593, this theory is of course dependent upon the belief in a very early date for the Sonnets; it is supported by GODWIN, in his *New Study of the Sonnets of Sh.*, and by "C. C. B.," a contributor to *Notes & Queries* (11th s., 5: 190), on the basis of theories of such a date. No Pembrokist, of course, could consider this view; and MINTO points out that there is no reason to suppose that Marlowe knew Southampton either.

BOADEN proposed the name of Daniel, on the ground that he was probably regarded by Sh. as his master in lyrical poetry (see above, under "Sources and Analogues"). He also calls attention to Daniel's reputation for learning, and finds the familiar spirit in Dr. Dee, a necromancer having some connection with the Pembrokes. DOWDEN gives some countenance to this view (though without accepting it): "Daniel's reputation stood high; . . . he was brought up at Wilton, the seat of the Pembrokes, and in 1601 he inscribed his *Defence of Ryme* to William Herbert." Mrs. STOPES does the same, in her article in *Poet Lore*, 1890, recalling that Daniel's *Masque of the Twelve Goddesses* "introduced Night and Sleep," and that it has been said that Daniel "supplanted Sh. in the coveted post of the Master of the Revels." The most ardent defender of Daniel's claim is CREIGHTON, in his articles in *Blackwood's* for 1901; he finds an anagram of Daniel (all but the D!) in the italicized "Alien" pen, and develops an elaborate theory of Daniel and Sh. as rivals for the post of Poet Laureate. The proof is far too eccentric to deserve serious consideration. On the other hand, there appear to be no important objections to this theory, based on the date or character of the claimant.

The view that Drayton may have been the rival poet was proposed by R. H. LEGIS, in a communication to *Notes & Queries* in 1884. Fear of the greatness of *Polyolbion*, and the "dedicated words" found at the beginnings of

certain books of that poem, are among the details of this theory. "In the composition of this, the most extensive poem since Spenser, Drayton was aided on all sides by his compeers," — who are thus reduced from supernatural to human beings. Drayton's epithet of "golden-mouthed" is alluded to in the "golden quill" of 85, 3. Legis's argument has found few adherents. WYNDHAM, however, believing in several rival poets, concludes: "If compelled to select one, . . . I should select Drayton." (*Poems of Sh.*, p. 258.) Drayton was "one of the 'learned'"; he praised Sh.'s *Lucrece* in 1594, but withdrew the passage in his edition of 1596; he was part author of the pamphlet on Sir John Oldcastle, written in 1600 as a retort on Sh.'s *Henry IV*. (For his alleged borrowings from Sh., see the views of Wyndham and others in the section on Sources and Analogues, above.) These are possible grounds for his claim.

In recent years attention has been attracted to the view that Barnabe Barnes was the rival poet, through the persistent but practically unseconded nomination of Sir SIDNEY LEE. Barnes was "a poetic panegyrist of Southampton and a prolific sonneteer, who was deemed by contemporary critics certain to prove a great poet. His first collection of sonnets, *Parthenophil & Parthenophe*, . . . was printed in 1593. . . . In a sonnet that Barnes addressed in this earliest volume to the 'virtuous' Earl of Southampton, he declared that his patron's eyes were the 'heavenly lamps that give the Muses light,' and that his sole ambition was 'by flight to rise' to a height worthy of his patron's 'virtues.'" Sh. may be thought to allude to this in S. 78, 5–8. (*Life*, pp. 132–33.) See also various passages in the commentary (traceable through the index), where Lee also finds evidence of Sh.'s sensitive interest in Barnes's verse. The supposed references to the supernatural (S. 86) he explains by saying that "Sh. detected a touch of magic in the man's writing"; — on which it may be observed that if he did, then "the less Shakespeare he." Lee also reiterates the argument that Barnes was fond of calling his poems "hymns," though he promptly destroys the force of it by showing the prevalence of the term, as is pointed out in the notes to S. 85. Most critics find little to be said for this Barnes theory. In the first place, as BEECHING observes (Intro., p. xlvi), the dates are not favorable; Barnes's collection was entered on the Stationers' Register only a month after the publication of *V. & A.* Moreover, even those who consider Barnes's praise of Southampton as pertinent to the Sonnets question are likely to find it incredible that Sh. should have considered him worthy of serious notice as a poet.

Before discussing the most important of the identifications, we may note rapidly certain lesser theories. FLEAY gives some attention to Thomas Nash, believing (*Biog. Chronicle*, 2: 218) that S. 86 "refers ironically to a prosaic sonnet by Nash in *Pierce Pennilesse*, accompanying a complaint that Amyntas' (Southampton's) name was omitted in the sonnet catalogue of English heroes appended to Spenser's *F.Q.*"; the proof being that in this passage Nash uses the words "full sail." But elsewhere FLEAY finds the "better spirit" to be Gervase Markham, whose non-extant *Thyrsis & Daphne* he supposes to have been written in rivalry with *V. & A.* "He was learned, had 'proud sail' with a vengeance, and his poem [*Sir Richard Grenville*, 1595] was dic-

tated by the spirit of Grenville." W. R. ALGER, in his essays on "Sh.'s Sonnets and Friendship" (1862), argues for the recognition of Ben Jonson as the rival. HENRY BROWN, in his book on the Sonnets (1870), favors both Francis Davison and John Davies, chiefly on the ground of dedications which they penned; see notes on Sonnets, 78, 82, and 86. W. C. HAZLITT identifies Griffin, author of *Fidessa*, in S. 80 (see the notes). BUTLER, with his view of an extraordinarily early date, is inclined toward Watson and his sonnets of 1582. WYNDHAM finds a possible case for Marston, who is supposed to have been an opponent of Sh. in the *poetomachia*, and who boasts of a "genius that attends my soul." VON MAUNTZ, in his *Heraldik in Diensten der Sh.-Forschung* (1903), proposes Gabriel Harvey, on the ground of supposed allusions to Sh., Nash, and the Dark Lady, in *Pierces Supererogation;* the familiar spirit of the Sonnets he takes to be an allusion to "some familiar spright" in the postscript to Harvey's poem "Gorgon, or the Wonderfull Yeare." And MACKAIL (*Essays and Studies by Members of the English Association*, vol. 3, 1912, pp. 66–69) conjectures that the rival poet is none other than the author of "A Lover's Complaint," which may have been found in the same MS. book with the Sonnets because written for the same patron.

Lastly, George Chapman has been the most widely accepted claimant for identification as rival poet, since being proposed by Professor MINTO in 1874. Minto's principal evidence is as follows (*Char. of Eng. Poets*, pp. 222–23): "Chapman was a man of overpowering enthusiasm, ever eager in magnifying poetry, and advancing fervent claims to supernatural inspiration. In 1594 he published a poem called 'The Shadow of Night,' which goes far to establish his identity as Sh.'s rival. In the Dedication, after animadverting severely on vulgar searchers after knowledge, he exclaims: 'Now what a supererogation in wit is this, to think Skill so mightily pierced with their loves that she should prostitutely show them her secrets, when she will scarcely be looked upon by others but with invocation, fasting, watching; yea, not without having drops of their souls like a heavenly familiar.' Here we have something like a profession of the familiar ghost that Sh. saucily laughs at. But Sh.'s rival gets his intelligence by night: special stress is laid in the sonnet upon the aid of his compeers by night and his nightly familiar. Well, Chapman's poem is called 'The Shadow of Night,' and its purpose is to extol the wonderful powers of Night in imparting knowledge to her votaries. He addresses her with fervent devotion:

> Rich-taper'd sanctuary of the blest,
> Palace of truth, made all of tears and rest,
> To thy black shades and desolation
> I consecrate my life.

And he cries:

> All you possess'd with indepressed spirits,
> Endued with nimble and aspiring wits,
> Come consecrate with me to sacred Night
> Your whole endeavours, and detest the light. . . .

No pen can anything eternal write
That is not steep'd in humour of the Night.

It is not simply that night is the best season for study; the enthusiastic poet finds more active assistance than silence and freedom from interruption. When the avenues of sense are closed by sleep, his soul rises to the court of Skill (the mother of knowledge, who must be propitiated by drops of the soul like an heavenly familiar), and if he could only remember what he learns there no secret would be hid from him.

Let soft sleep,
Binding my senses, loosen my working soul,
That in her highest pitch she may control
The court of Skill, compact of mystery,
Wanting but franchisement and memory
To reach all secrets.

As regards the other feature in the rival poet, 'the proud full sail of his great verse,' that applies with almost too literal exactness to the alexandrines of Chapman's Homer, part of which appeared in 1596; and as for its being bound for the prize of Sh.'s patron, both Pembroke and Southampton were included in the list of those honoured with dedicatory sonnets in a subsequent edition. Chapman's chief patron was Sir Francis Walsingham, whose daughter Sir Philip Sidney had married, and nothing could have been more natural than that the old man should introduce his favourite to the Countess of Pembroke or her son."

Later critics have, in a number of instances, not only accepted Minto's evidence but reënforced it. DOWDEN, though remaining agnostic, thinks this the most fortunate of the guesses: "No Elizabethan poet wrote ampler verse, none scorned 'ignorance more,' or more haughtily asserted his learning, than Chapman. In 'The Tears of Peace' (1609), Homer as a spirit visits and inspires him: the claim to such inspiration may have been often made by the translator of Homer in earlier years." (Intro., p. 20.) TYLER considers the identification "so complete as to leave no reasonable doubt on the matter" (p. 33). BEECHING, though not accepting the theory, contributes — for those who do — the fact that in 1598 Chapman "wrote a poem to that celebrated Doctor Harriot of whom Marlowe had said in his 'atheistical' way that he could juggle better than Moses." (Intro., p. xlv.) But by far the most elaborate contribution to the Chapman doctrine has been made by ACHESON, in his *Sh. & the Rival Poet* (1903). It is impossible to outline his argument here, as it involves an intricate theory of a prolonged quarrel between Chapman and Sh., of which much evidence is found in the latter's plays. For a number of the alleged parallels between Chapman's poetry and the Sonnets, see the commentary, with the aid of the index. The more respectful allusions to Chapman, those in the rival-poet group, Acheson puts after the publication of the first part of the Homer, in 1598. Others who support Minto's theory, with varying degrees of assurance, are FURNIVALL, ROLFE, BOAS, and BRANDL.

The objections are largely negative. LEE observes: "Chapman had produced no conspicuously 'great verse' till he began his translation of Homer in 1598; and although he appended in 1610 to a complete edition of his translation a sonnet to Southampton, it was couched in the coldest terms of formality, and it was one of a series of sixteen sonnets each addressed to a distinguished nobleman with whom the writer implies that he had no previous relations. . . . [As to the passages in 'The Shadow of Night,'] there is really no connection between Sh.'s theory of the supernatural and nocturnal sources of his rival's influence with Chapman's trite allusion to the current faith in the power of 'nightly familiars' over men's minds and lives, or in Chapman's invitation to his literary comrades to honour Night with him. . . . It could be as easily argued on like grounds that Sh. was drawing on other authors. Nash in his prose tract, called independently *The Terrors of the Night*, which was also printed in 1594, described the nocturnal habits of 'familiars' more explicitly than Chapman." (*Life*, pp. 134–35.) WYNDHAM doubts if Chapman can be said to have "eternized" anybody (p. 254); and BEECHING queries, "Was Chapman the sort of man to write affectionate sonnets to a youth?" WALSH, commenting on Acheson's evidence, remarks: "His argument fails in one item by himself considered material: he cannot show by external testimony that Chapman courted the favour of either of Sh.'s known patrons" * (p. 271). He proceeds, however, to say that the rival poet may have been one who celebrated *any* distinguished patron of the time, — the Countess of Pembroke, for example.

On the whole, this Chapman theory, while it is far from having been shown to be impossible, has been accepted with decidedly uncritical assurance. The case is the same as with the theories respecting the friend: since no other claimant is provided with better evidence, the disposition is to accept what is offered rather than be without an identification. In the case of this problem there is reason for rather more hopefulness than in the other, since the rival poet would seem less likely than the friend to have been a man unknown to fame. On the other hand it may be said that if, as some understand it, Sh.'s praise of the rival poet is ironical, he may well have been an ambitious nobody destined for oblivion. For the present, at any rate, DOWDEN's conclusion must stand: "In the end we are forced to confess that the poet remains as dim a figure as the patron."

* For want of this, Acheson devises a theory that Chapman sought the patronage of Southampton for his early poems, in 1594 and 1595, and was rejected. (His "dedicated words" were "undoubtedly still in manuscript" when Sh. wrote S. 82; so we are told on p. 127.) For this he produces not a particle of real proof, but later repeatedly refers to it as known fact.

"WILLOBIE HIS AVISA"

THE book bearing the above title, which appeared in 1594 and in various subsequent editions, has been associated with the discussion of Sh.'s Sonnets to an extent which makes some account of it necessary. The fuller title is "Willobie his Avisa: or the true Picture of a modest Maid, and of a chast and constant wife"; supplemented, in later editions, by "an Apologie, shewing the true meaning of Willoby his Avisa: with the victory of English Chastitie." The work is a moral poem, of bourgeois tone, praising chastity as personified in the character of Avisa, a young woman who, because of extraordinary charms, is subjected to great temptation both before and after her marriage. Of her wooers some are presented as villains of various nationalities; but one, the supposed author of the poem, Henry Willobie, is afflicted with a persistent and sincere, though guilty passion, and Avisa treats him with some kindness, though with inexorable virtue. The poem ends with her final dismissal of him. In Canto 44 occurs a prose interlude, which is chiefly responsible for the theory that the story partly concerns Sh. It reads as follows:

H. W. being sodenly affected with the contagion of a fantasticall fit, at the first sight of A, pyneth a while in secret griefe, at length not able any longer to indure the burning heate of so fervent a humour, bewrayeth the secresy of his disease unto his familiar frend W. S. who not long before had tryed the curtesy of the like passion, and was now newly recovered of the like infection; yet finding his frend let bloud in the same vaine, he took pleasure for a tyme to see him bleed, & in steed of stopping the issue, he inlargeth the wound, with the sharpe rasor of a willing conceit, perswading him that he thought it a matter very easy to be compassed, & no doubt with payne, diligence & some cost in tyme to be obtayned. Thus this miserable comforter comforting his frend with an impossibilitie, eyther for that he now would secretly laugh at his frends folly, that had given occasion not long before unto others to laugh at his owne, or because he would see whether an other could play his part better than himselfe, & in vewing a far off the course of this loving Comedy, he determined to see whether it would sort to a happier end for this new actor, then it did for the old player. But at length this Comedy was like to have growen to a Tragedy, by the weake and feeble estate that H. W. was brought unto, by a desperate vewe of an impossibility of obtaining his purpose, til Time & Necessity, being his best Phisitions brought him a plaster, if not to heale, yet in part to ease his maladye. In all which discourse is lively represented the unrewly rage of unbrydeled fancy, having the raines to rove at liberty, with the dyvers & sundry changes of affections & temptations, which Will, set loose from Reason, can devise, &c.

There follows Willobie's complaint, in verse, succeeded (in cantos 45 and 47) by remarks on the part of W. S., inquiring regarding his friend's sadness, and giving advice for the wooing of cold ladies; thereupon Willobie renews his vain attacks, and we hear no more of the cynical friend. "W. S.," then, appears as one of the group of characters who represent the view that woman's virtue is never wholly impregnable, — the doctrine which it is the professed purpose of the poem to oppose.

To this must be added — since to some the circumstance has seemed significant — the fact that in some prefatory verses Sh. is incidentally mentioned as the author of *Lucrece*.

INGLEBY, having occasion to reprint the passage last mentioned in the *Sh. Allusion Books* and *Century of Praise*, also reprinted the passage from Canto 44, and expressed the opinion that "W. S." stood for Sh., on the grounds that he appears "as a standard authority on love" and that he is called an "old player." (*C. of P.*, ed. 1879, p. 11.) This conjecture found acceptance, at least as an interesting hypothesis, with a number of persons, including so distinguished a critic as SWINBURNE, who, in his *Study of Sh.*, referred to *Willobie his Avisa* as "the one contemporary book which has ever been supposed to throw any direct or indirect light on the mystic matter" of the Sonnets (p. 62). Partly as a result of his encouragement, Grosart brought out a reprint of the poem in 1880.* DOWDEN examined the matter in his edition of the Sonnets (1881), and concluded: "Assuming that W. S. is William Sh., we learn that he had loved and recovered from the infection of his passion before the end of 1594. The chaste Avisa is as unlike as possible the dark woman of the Sonnets; nor does anything appear which can connect Henry Willobie with Sh.'s young friend of the Sonnets, except the fact that the initials of the only begetter's name were W. H., those of Henry Willobie reversed, and that Henry Willobie assails the chastity of a married woman. He is, however, repulsed by the chaste Avisa. Except in the reference to W. S.'s love, and his recovery from passion, I see no possible point of connection between *Willobie's Avisa* and Sh.'s Sonnets." (Intro., pp. 42–43.) FLEAY, on the other hand, in his *Life and Work of Sh.* (1886), represented the work as of the greatest importance for the study of the Sonnets, and identified Avisa as the Dark Lady, conjecturing that she was an innkeeper's daughter in the "West of England."† This notion was further developed by PLUMPTRE, in an article in the *Contemporary Review* for 1889, wherein he constructed an outline of certain provincial journeyings of Sh. in 1593, and located Avisa the Dark Lady in Glastonbury. LEE gave some further countenance to these conjectures, both in his *Life of Sh.* and in the account of the actual Henry Willoughby in the *D. N. B.* "The mention of 'W. S.' as 'the old player,' and the employment of theatrical imagery in discussing his relations with Willobie, must be coupled with the fact that Sh., at a date when mentions of him in print were rare, was eulogized by name as the author of *Lucrece* in some prefatory verses

* Another reprint was made by C. Hughes, 1904; and still another by Acheson, as a supplement to his *Mistress Davenant*, 1913. In 1886 the Spenser Society reprinted the edition of 1635. Hughes, in his edition, discovered a real Henry Willoughby and a real Avisa (or Avice) Forward.

† This is due to the single stanza which forms Canto 46, in which Willobie thus locates the heroine:

> Seest yonder howse, where hanges the badge
> Of Englands Saint, when captaines cry
> Victorious land, to conquering rage,
> Loe, there my hopelesse helpe doth ly:
> And there that frendly foe doth dwell,
> That makes my hart thus rage and swell.

to the volume. From such considerations the theory of W. S.'s identity with Willobie's acquaintance acquires substance. If we assume that it was Sh. who took a roguish delight in watching his friend Willobie suffer the disdain of 'chaste Avisa' because he had 'newly recovered' from the effects of a like experience, it is clear that the theft of Sh.'s mistress by another friend did not cause him deep or lasting distress." (*Life*, pp. 157–58.) BEECHING, on the other hand, dismisses the identification with a few words, in his edition of the Sonnets (1904): "The sole ground for the conjecture is that W. S. is referred to as the 'old player.' But the love affair had been previously spoken of as 'a comedy like to end in a tragedy,' and Willobie himself is called the 'new actor.' There is, therefore, not the slightest reason for taking the one expression more literally than the other. And where, it may be asked, is there anything in the Sonnets that could be referred to as a recovery from love?" (Intro., p. xxvii n.)

It remained for ACHESON to develop the Ingleby-Fleay view of *Willobie his Avisa* in proportions hitherto undreamed-of, in his book called *Mistress Davenant the Dark Lady of Sh.'s Sonnets* (1913). It is impossible to outline the argument of this work in brief,* as it is entangled with the writer's theory of Chapman as Sh.'s rival and enemy, and with his other theory of Matthew Roydon as author of *Willobie* and also of certain verses in *The Passionate Pilgrim* (beginning "Whenas thine eye hath chose the dame") which bear some resemblance to the argument of "W. S." in Canto 47. In Acheson's view Avisa is to be identified with Mistress Jane Davenant of Oxford, W. S. with Southampton, and the whole poem is to be viewed as a scurrilous attack upon Sh. by Roydon, on account of which it was "called in" by the censors in 1599. This theory is ingenious and at times illusively plausible, but may be said without hesitation to be wholly destitute of proof in every essential particular.

The same thing is true not merely of this particular form of the theory, but of the entire hypothesis that *Willobie his Avisa* forms a commentary on the Sonnets. In the first place, no real reason has appeared for connecting the name of Sh. with the W. S. of the poem. W. S. had been in love and professed to be an authority on love; surely by no means an unique distinction. As to his being called an "old player," he is so called, as Beeching points out, precisely as Willobie is called a "new actor," and no one has identified Willobie with a theatrical personage. It might be argued that, if we knew W. S. to be Sh., the comedy-tragedy metaphor would have more point because one of the two persons concerned was a player in other than a metaphorical sense; and on the other hand it might be argued that its aptness would thereby be lessened. But assuming the former, we are still far from having proof that either of the lovers *was* an actor, much less that he was Sh. Neither is there any reason to associate the initials with the fact that Sh. is mentioned in prefatory verses. No connection with the story of Avisa is suggested in these verses, and the circumstances could, at most, be used only by way of reply in case any one

* See careful reviews of it, by S. A. Tannenbaum and by the present editor, noted in the Bibliography, under V, 1914 and 1915. What follows in the present section is in part reprinted from the latter review, in the *Journal of English and Germanic Philology*.

undertook to argue the improbability of Sh.'s being known to the author of *Willobie*. The prefatory epistle mentions both Sidney and Spenser in somewhat similar fashion; but should we, on that account, find it significant if any of the characters in the story bore names with the initials P. S. or E. S.? Moreover, it should be recalled that "W. S." is represented very unflatteringly in the story; so that, if the prefatory allusion to Sh. is eulogistic, as Lee regards it, we should not be likely to find the two mentions of him under the same auspices. The only other argument for the identification which can be taken at all seriously is the alleged resemblance of the verses in *The Passionate Pilgrim* (published five years later than *Avisa*) to W. S.'s advice on the subject of love. This resemblance is not very striking, apart from the cynical doctrine of seduction, which, as the Preface to *Willobie* abundantly emphasizes, was highly conventional; but even if it seemed to be significant, it would be very difficult to say of what. The author of the *Passionate Pilgrim* verses is wholly unknown, and Acheson — oddly enough — disposes of the only apparent ground for thinking them to represent Sh.'s doctrine, by alleging that they were written by Roydon. And whether we should suppose that Sh. or some one else imitated the work of the *Avisa* poet, or (assuming that the *Passionate Pilgrim* poem was written and was known long before it was published) that the latter was the imitator, there is still no reason for assuming that the personality of Sh. is to be associated with the speaker in *Avisa*. The notion, then, that Willobie's friend was Sh., or that Henry Willobie himself was Henry Wriothesley (Southampton), is precisely like the various theories that the W. H. of the Dedication is William Herbert, William Hall, William Hughes, William Hart, and William Hervey; it is open to any one to hold who finds pleasure in doing so, provided he does not draw inferences from it as from known facts.*

But even if the identification of Willobie's W. S. with Sh. had been found probable, there would still be no reason for viewing the poem as a commentary on the Sonnets. What should we have learned? That Sh. was said to have been lately in love, and to have recovered from the passion. Can we then assume that it was with the Dark Lady that he had been in love? This, in the first place, would imply an earlier date for the Sonnets than most critics find credible — if the affair was referred to as an old story in 1594. And as to recovery, as Beeching asks, what is there in the Sonnets of that? Moreover, is it safe to assume that Sh. was never in love but once? If his friends "laughed at his folly" in connection with the fascinating adulteress of the Sonnets, is it certain that this was the only opportunity he ever gave for such laughter? Of course there are those who believe that a single female personality dominated the poet's whole life and appears in all his works; but in that case, again, it would not be an experience from which he had "recovered."

As to the identification of Avisa with the Dark Lady, that is still less rea-

* Acheson supposes that he has confirmed the connection of *Avisa* with Sh., in showing that it was written by Roydon; on which it may be remarked (1) that he has not shown this with anything like adequacy; (2) that if he had, the chain of reasoning would amount to this: Roydon was a friend of Chapman's; Chapman was an enemy of Sh.'s (another unproved hypothesis); therefore when Roydon introduces a W. S. as a cynical person lately in love, it must be Sh.

sonable. Are we to understand, when W. S. is said to have recovered "from the like infection," that he had been in love with the *same person* as Willobie? There is nothing in the text to indicate it; on the contrary, Avisa's lovers and their arguments have been enumerated, — the list of them forms the very structure of this portion of the poem, — and W. S. appears only as Willobie's friend. Moreover, Avisa's virtue, it will be recalled, remains unconquered. When all is said, she remains the flower of English domestic virtue. The answer given by Fleay and Acheson to this is that the whole work is a satire, and is to be read by inversion. There is evidence, as we have seen, — and as appears further from the "apology" added in later editions, — that the poem was understood to involve personal allusions, and to be suspected on that account. But to admit this is quite a different matter from the supposition that the whole story is to be read as that of an *un*chaste lady. If it is, the point is very difficult to discover. To put the matter otherwise: suppose it to be the desire of the author to ridicule Sh. and his friend for having been concerned in an intrigue with a countrywoman, the circumstances being (if we take the story hinted in the Sonnets as our authority) that Sh. had first won her as his mistress, and had been supplanted by his friend. There are various satiric tales which might be devised to represent such a situation; but among them, it is safe to say, one would hardly find such a plot as this, — a virtuous lady is wooed by many lovers, and resists them all; H. W. joins the number, and after a repulse, consults W. S. for advice; W. S. bids him persist and hope for success; he does persist, but meets with a final repulse and adieu. If this be a burlesque, or satire, of the story which has generally been read in connection with the triangle of characters in the Sonnets, the difficult irony of a Defoe or a Swift pales into insignificance beside the ambiguity which its author attained.

It should perhaps be added that Acheson's identification of Avisa with Mistress Jane Davenant of Oxford is based on such proofs as the following. The Preface to the poem is dated at Oxford; we may therefore locate the action of the story there. The writer of the Preface refers to a certain "A. D." as known to him as being *equally virtuous* with Avisa; and D. is the initial of Davenant. A well-known bit of 17th century scandal associated Sh. with the mother of Sir William Davenant, — who, to be sure, was born in 1606, ten years after the period of the poem. Avisa was found at a house "where hangs the badge of England's saint," and in 1619 John Davenant, husband of Jane, was vintner of the Cross Inn — probably the cross of St. George.* The theory of the significance of *Willobie his Avisa* in connection with the Sonnets has thus found an appropriate *reductio ad absurdum*.

* This is the view of Acheson's later publication, the pamphlet called "A Woman Coloured Ill." In the original form his assumption was that Davenant was at one time proprietor of the George Inn, though evidence for this was wholly wanting.

MUSICAL SETTINGS

THE following list of musical settings for the Sonnets is from the account given in *A List of all the Songs and Passages in Sh. which have been set to Music*, published by the New Shakspere Society, 1884; with two items added (in brackets) from a list compiled by HELEN CLARKE, in *Shakespeariana*, 5: 543–44.

Sonnet 5. Richard Simpson. 1878.*

Sonnet 6. Richard Simpson. 1878.

Sonnet 7. Sir Henry Bishop (in *As You Like It*). 1824. (Lines 1–8.)
Richard Simpson. 1878.

Sonnet 18. Charles Horn (in *The Tempest*). 1821.
E. Loder (in "Six Songs"). 1838.
J. Reekes (in "Six Shakspere Songs"). Ab. 1850. (Lines 1–3, 9.)
Robert Hoar. 1876.
Lady Ramsey of Banff.

Sonnet 25. Sir Henry Bishop (in *Two Gentlemen of Verona*). 1821. (Lines 1–4; sung in a duet by Julia and Sylvia, the latter singing lines 1–4 of S. 97.)

Sonnet 27. Richard Simpson. 1878.

Sonnet 29. Sir Henry Bishop (in *T.G.V.*). 1821. (Lines 1–4, 9–12.)

Sonnet 33. Sir Henry Bishop (in *Twelfth Night*). 1820.
J. Reekes (in "Six Shakspere Songs"). Ab. 1850. (Lines 1–4, 9–12.)

Sonnet 40. Sir Henry Bishop (in *T.N.*). 1820.
Charles Horn (in *The Tempest*). 1821.

Sonnet 54. Sir Henry Bishop (in *T.N.*). 1820. (Lines 1–4.)
George Barker (in the "Ballad Album"). 1870.

Sonnet 58. Richard Simpson. 1878.

Sonnet 59. Richard Simpson. 1878.

[Sonnet 62. Charles Horn (in *The Tempest*). 1821.]

Sonnet 63. Richard Simpson. 1878.

Sonnet 64. Sir Henry Bishop (in *T.G.V.*). 1821. (Lines 5–12.)

Sonnet 71. Richard Simpson. 1878.

Sonnet 73. Sir Henry Bishop (in *T.G.V.*). 1821. (Lines 1–8.)
Richard Simpson. 1878.

Sonnet 81. Richard Simpson. 1878.

[Sonnet 84. Sir Henry Bishop (in *T.G.V.*). 1821.]

* This Richard Simpson, it appears, composed airs for the entire collection of Sonnets, but only a dozen were published, 1878.

Sonnet 87. J. Reekes (in "Six Shakspere Songs"). Ab. 1850. (Lines 1–4.)
Caracciolo.

Sonnet 92. Sir Henry Bishop (in *T.G.V.*). 1821.
(Line 1 reads, "Say tho' you strive to steal yourself away.")

Sonnet 96. Richard Simpson. 1878.

Sonnet 97. Sir Henry Bishop (in *T.G.V.*). 1821. (Lines 1–4.)

Sonnet 109. M. P. King.
Sir Henry Bishop (in *T.G.V.*). 1821. (Lines 1–4, 13–14.)

Sonnet 110. Richard Simpson. 1878. (Two renderings.)

Sonnet 116. John Braham (in *Taming of the Shrew*). 1828. Lines 5–14.
(Called "Love is an ever-fixed mark.")

Sonnet 123. Sir Henry Bishop (in *As You Like It*). 1824. (Lines 1–4, 13–14.)

Sonnet 148. Sir Henry Bishop (in *As You Like It*). 1824. (Lines 1–12.)

In the *Academy* of Feb. 3, 1894 (p. 110) is a mention of Sonnets 18, 29, and 99 as having been set to music by A. C. Mackenzie, and sung in London. ROLFE, commenting on this in a note in *The Critic* (n.s., 21: 238), states that Sonnet 29 had been set five times previously, and that Sonnet 109 had had four musical renderings, but gives no details or authority. HENRY BROWN, in his essay on "The Singing of the Sonnets" (in *Sh.'s Patrons*, 1912), mentions that Sonnet 33 was sung at a concert after a performance of *Cymbeline* on June 19, 1822.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

THIS list is divided into six sections, under each of which it is chronologically arranged:

I. Separate editions of the Sonnets (including those which also contain "A Lover's Complaint").
II. Editions in collected Poems and Works of Shakespeare.
III. Translations.
IV. Books and monographs devoted to the Sonnets.
V. Articles in serial publications.
VI. Books containing incidental matter on the Sonnets.

The first five sections are as complete as the available data have made possible; Section VI includes only works cited in the commentary, or believed to be significant for other reasons. Books and articles dealing with the Baconian theory as applied to the Sonnets are not included, since they form a special problem of interest to a distinct group of readers.

Publishers' names are in parentheses. The place of publication is London unless otherwise noted. An asterisk prefixed to the date indicates that the work has not been seen by the present editor, but is entered from another bibliography. Second and later editions are not listed separately, but are mentioned under the date of the first edition. No attempt is made to give the full contents of title-pages, or to include format and collation.

The index to the Bibliography will be found to refer each title cited to the year of publication and the group in which it is listed. It can therefore be used for certain purposes as an independent reference list; thus, the entry "Dowden. I, 1881," indicates that Dowden edited the Sonnets in 1881, and "Bodenstedt. IIIa, 1862," that Bodenstedt translated them into German in 1862.

I. SEPARATE EDITIONS

1609. Shake-speares Sonnets. Never before Imprinted.

Two title-pages are distinguishable, one with the imprint "By G. Eld for T. T. and are to be solde by John Wright, dwelling at Christ Church gate," the other "By G. Eld for T. T. and are to be solde by William Aspley." The former is the basis of the Praetorius facsimile of 1886, the latter of the Clarendon Press facsimile of 1905.

1830. Sonnets of Sh. and Milton. (Moxon.)

*1839. Sonnets of Sh. (W. Smith.) [Jaggard, p. 453a.]

1840. Sonnets by W. Sh. A new edition. (Ball & Arnold.)

*1850. Sonnets. . . . Facsimile reprint of the first edition. [Jaggard, p. 453a.]

1859. Sonnets of W. Sh., rearranged and divided into four parts. With an introduction and explanatory notes [by R. Cartwright]. (J. R. Smith.)

1862. Sh.'s Sonnets: reproduced in facsimile by the new process of photo-zincography in use at Her Majesty's Ordnance Survey Office. From the unrivalled Original in the Library of Bridgewater House [etc.]. (Lovell Reeve & Co.)

1865. Sh.'s Sonnets. Boston. (Ticknor & Fields.)

1868. Sh.'s Sonnets, with Commentaries by T. D. Budd. Philadelphia. (J. Campbell.)

1870. Sh.'s Sonnets and A Lover's Complaint. Reprinted in the orthography and punctuation of the original edition of 1609. (J. R. Smith.)

1877. Sh.'s Sonnets. Vest-pocket Series. Boston. (Osgood.)

1878. Sonnets by W. Sh., illustrated by Sir John Gilbert and others Emerald Series. (Routledge.)

In 1862, 1863, 1875, 1877, etc., appeared volumes entitled "Sh.'s Songs and Sonnets, illustrated by John Gilbert," containing in some cases only three of the Sonnets, in others fifteen. The 1878 volume is complete.

1881. Sonnets of W. Sh. Edited by Edward Dowden. (Kegan Paul.)

Another edition of the same year (Parchment Series) gives an abbreviated form of the introduction, and a revision of the notes. Another abbreviated edition ("Dryden Library") appeared in 1905.

*1881. Sonnets of Sh. English Library. Zürich. (Rudolphi.) [Jaggard, p. 454a.]

1883. Sh.'s Sonnets. Edited by W. J. Rolfe. New York. (Harper.)

Introduction and notes. A revised edition in 1890; a new edition (American Book Co.) in 1905.

[In 1883 also appeared "Some well-known 'Sugar'd Sonnets' by W. Sh. Resugar'd with ornamental borders . . . by E. J. Ellis and T. J. Ellis." This contains ten Sonnets, with illustrations and notes in a humorous vein, and is perhaps notable as the only work in this entire list which does not take the subject seriously.]

[1886.] Sh.'s Sonnets. The first Quarto, 1609, facsimile in photo-lithography (from the British Museum copy), by C. Prætorius. Introduction by T. Tyler. (Prætorius.)

1890. Sh.'s Sonnets, edited with Notes and Introduction by Thomas Tyler. (Nutt.)

A new edition, 1899, with appendix in reply to critics.

1895. Sonnets of W. Sh., with decorations by Ernest G. Treglown, engraved on wood by Charles Carr [etc.]. Birmingham and London. (Napier.)

*1895. Sonnets of Sh., edited by W. A. Brockington; illustrated by E. G. Treglown. (Tylston & Edwards, etc.) [*Jahrbuch*, 33: 317.]

1896. Sh.'s Sonnets. Edited by I. Gollancz. Temple Shakespeare. (Dent.) [Introduction and notes.]

1897. Sh.'s Sonnets. English Love Sonnets series. Boston. (Copeland & Day.)

1899. Sh.'s Sonnets, reconsidered and in part rearranged, with introductory chapters, notes, and a reprint of the original 1609 edition, by Samuel Butler. (Fifield.)

1899. Sh.'s Sonnets. Illustrated by Henry Ospovat. (Lane.)

1899. Sh.'s Sonnets, reprinted from the edition of 1609. Seen through the press by T. S. Moore; with designs by C. S. Ricketts. (Hacon & Ricketts.)

Another edition in 1903.

1899. Sonnets of W. Sh. Decorations by C. Dean. (Bell.)

1899. Sonnets of Sh. Seen through the press by Elbert Hubbard. New York. (Roycroft Press.)

1900. Sh.'s Sonnets. Bibelot edition. Edited by J. P. Briscoe. (Gay & Bird.) [Introduction.]

1901. Sonnets of Sh., now newly imprinted from the first edition of 1609 by Clarke Conwell at the Elston Press. New Rochelle, N.Y.

1901. Sh.'s Sonnets. Old World Series. Portland, Maine. (Mosher.)

Another edition in 1907.

1902. Sonnets of Sh. Lover's Library. (Lane.)

1902. Sonnets of Sh. [Reprinted from the Quarto, with corrections.] Guildford. (Astolat Press.)

1902. Sh.'s Sonnets, with Introduction and Notes by J. Dennis, and illustrations by Byam Shaw. Chiswick edition. (Bell.)

*1902. Sh.'s Sonnets. Edited by Mathilde Blind. (De la More Press.) [Jaggard, p. 455b.]

[1903.] Sonnets by W. Sh. Ariel Booklets. New York. (Putnam.) [Glossary.]

*1903. Sh.'s Sonnets. Edited with notes by H. N. Hudson. Windsor edition. Edinburgh. (Jack.) [Jaggard, p. 455b.]

1904. Sh.'s Sonnets. Edited by C. C. Stopes. King's Shakespeare. (De la More Press.) [Introduction and notes.]

1904. Sh.'s Sonnets. Favorite Classics edition. Introduction by G. Brandes. (Heinemann.)

[1904.] Sh.'s Sonnets and A Lover's Complaint. Ellen Terry edition. Edited and compared with the best texts by J. Talfourd Blair. Glasgow. (Bryce.)

1904. Sonnets of Sh. Edited by H. C. Beeching. Athenæum Press series. Boston. (Ginn.) [Introduction and notes.]

1904. Sonnets by W. Sh. Carefully corrected and compared with [the edition of 1609]. (Astolat Press.)

1905. Sonnets of Sh. Introduction and Notes by W. J. Craig. Little Quartos edition. (Methuen.)

1905. Sh.'s Sonnets. A reproduction in facsimile of the first edition (1609). With Introduction and Bibliography by Sidney Lee. Oxford. (Clarendon Press.)

1905. Sh.'s Sonnets. Stratford-on-Avon. (Sh. Head Press.) [Final note by A. H. Bullen.]

1906. Sonnets of Sh. [The songs also included.] Royal Library. (Humphreys.)

1907. Sh.'s Sonnets and A Lover's Complaint. With an Introduction by W. H. Hadow. Tudor and Stuart Library. Oxford. (Clarendon Press.) [Introduction and textual notes.]

1908. Sh.'s Complete Sonnets. A new arrangement, with an Introduction and Notes by C. M. Walsh. (Unwin.)

1909. Sh.'s Sonnets. Tercentenary edition. Hammersmith. (Doves Press.)

1909. Sh.'s Sonnets. (Sidgwick & Jackson.)

*1910. Sh.'s Sonnets. Leipzig. (Rowohlt.) [*Jahrbuch*, 48: 303.]

[1911.] Sh.'s Sonnets. Langham Booklets.

[1911.] Sh.'s Sonnets. (Siegle, Hill & Co.) [Contains only Sonnets 1–92.]

[1911.] Sh.'s Sonnets. Queen's Library. (Siegle.)

[1912.] Sh.'s Sonnets. Decorations by A. J. Iorio. (Harrap.)

1912. Sh.'s Sonnets. Decorations by A. J. Iorio. Boston & New York. (Caldwell.)

[1912.] Sonnets of Sh. Arden Books.

1913. Sonnets of Mr. W. Sh. Riccardi Press Booklets.

1913. Sonnets and A Lover's Complaint. Edited by R. M. Alden. Tudor Shakespeare. New York. (Macmillan.) [Introduction and notes.]

[In 1913 also appeared "Sonnets by Sh." with decorations by Edith A. Ibbs; fifteen selected Sonnets only. (Constable.)]

II. EDITIONS IN COLLECTED POEMS AND WORKS

[After 1800 editions of the Works of Shakespeare, and collections like Chalmers's *British Poets*, are not listed unless they include a new text or significant apparatus for the Sonnets.]

1640. Poems, written by Wil. Shake-speare, Gent. Printed at London by Tho. Cotes and are to be sold by John Benson [etc.].

This contains 146 of the Sonnets (omitting Nos. 18, 19, 43, 56, 75, 76, 96, 126), arranged in groups, with group titles, and interspersed with various lyrics by Shakespeare and others. This text and arrangement formed the basis of most of the 18th century editions before Malone.

1710. A Collection of Poems, in Two Volumes; Being all the Miscellanies of Mr. William Shakespeare [etc.]. (Bernard Lintott.)

The first volume is dated 1709. The second contains the Sonnets, printed from the quarto of 1609, with few corrections. The two volumes are frequently found bound in one. It is Capell's ex-

emplar of this edition, included in his bequest to Trinity College Library, Cambridge, which he corrected as the copy for a projected edition, and which is frequently referred to as the "Capell MS."

1710. Works of Mr. William Sh. Volume the Seventh. Containing Venus and Adonis, The Rape of Lucrece, and His Miscellany Poems. (E. Curll & E. Sanger.)

This was issued as a final volume in Rowe's edition, but appears to have been edited by Charles Gildon. A revised edition appeared in 1714, supplemental to the Works of Sh. of that year, and was now called Volume the Ninth. For an account of both volumes, see the article in *Modern Language Notes*, cited under V, 1916.[1]

1725. Venus and Adonis, Tarquin and Lucrece, and Mr. Sh.'s Miscellany Poems. . . . Revised and corrected, with a preface by Dr. Sewell. (A. Bettesworth, etc.).

Issued as volume 7 of Pope's edition of the Works of 1723–25. The text is revised apparently from the 1710 (Gildon) version of the 1640 edition. A newly revised edition, 1728 (also found with Tonson's imprint) was issued as volume 10 of Pope's 1728 edition.

[1760.] Poems on Several Occasions, by Sh. (Sold by A. Murden, R. Newton, etc.)

Apparently a reprint of the Sewell text of 1728. The exact date is not known.

1766. Twenty of the Plays of Sh. [etc., edited by] G. Steevens. (Tonson.)

The Sonnets are included in volume 4, in accordance with this statement in the Advertisement: "I have likewise reprinted Sh.'s Sonnets, from a copy published in 1609, by G. Eld." The exact text and punctuation of the Quarto are followed, but not the italics and capitalization. (According to Jaggard, p. 452, the Sonnets were also issued separately.)

1771. Poems, containing I. Venus and Adonis; . . . IV. Sonnets. (T. Ewing.) Dublin.

Part of Ewing's 1771 Shakespeare; largely based on the Sewell text of 1728.

1774. Poems written by Sh. [Edited by F. Gentleman.] (J. Bell & C. Etherington.)

Uniform with Bell's 1774 Shakespeare. The text is based on that of 1728 and 1771.

[1775.] Poems written by Mr. W. Sh. Reprinted for Thomas Evans.

Intended (according to Jaggard) as a supplement to the Capell edition of 1760–68. The text is apparently based on Sewell's of 1728.

1780. Supplement to the edition of Sh.'s Plays published in 1778. . . . Containing additional observations by several of the former

[1] Jaggard lists another 1714 edition (p. 434b), with the title-page of Lintott's 1710 volume, "A Collection of Poems," etc.; but this is erroneous, as no such volume is in the Boston Library where Jaggard locates it, nor — apparently — elsewhere.

commentators: to which are subjoined the genuine poems of the same author, . . . with notes by the editor and others. [E. Malone.] (C. Bathurst, etc.)

The first of the Malone texts, with notes chiefly by him and Steevens. The text is based on that of 1609, with evident use of the earlier 18th century versions, and (as the Cambridge editors suppose) of Capell's MS. revision.

1790. Plays and Poems of W. Sh. . . . with the corrections and illustrations of various commentators. E. Malone. (Rivington.)

The Sonnets in volume 10, with the same material as in the volume of 1780, but revised.

1794. Plays and Poems. . . . Dublin. (Exshaw.)

The "Dublin Shakespeare"; Sonnets in volume 16. The text and notes are from Malone's of 1790.

1795. Works of the British Poets; with Prefaces, biographical and critical, by Robert Anderson. (J. & A. Arch; J. Mundell & Co., etc.)

The Sonnets are included in The Poetical Works of William Sh., volume 2, with separate title-page (dated 1793, Mundell, Edinburgh). The text is Malone's of 1780.

[1795.] The Poems of W. Sh., viz., Venus and Adonis, The Rape of Lucrece, Sonnets, . . . with Mr. Capell's history of the origin of Sh.'s fables. To which is added a glossary. (E. Jeffery.)

Jaggard lists what is apparently another edition in 1805. The Sonnets text is that of Malone (1780).

1796. Plays and Poems of W. Sh. Philadelphia. (Bioren & Madan.)

The Sonnets are in volume 8. The Malone text. [In the copy of this volume belonging to the Boston Public Library is a photographic facsimile of the title-page of The Poems of William Sh., Philadelphia, Bioren and Madan, 1796 (presumably a separate issue of a portion of volume 8), with a MS. letter alluding to a copy privately owned in Washington, D.C., as "the unique first American edition of Shakespeare's Poems." The Library of Congress knows nothing of such a separate issue.]

[1797.] Poetical Works of Sh., with the Life of the Author. Cooke's edition. (C. Cooke.)

The Malone text (1780) of the Sonnets.

1797. The Poems of W. Sh. (G. & J. Robinson, etc.)

Volume 7 of Robinson's Works of Sh. The Malone text (1780) of the Sonnets.

1804. Poems by W. Sh., with illustrative remarks, original and select. [Edited by W. C. Oulton.] (Chapple.)

The Sonnets in volume 2. The 1640 text, with a slight variation in the order; notes, chiefly from Malone.

1806. Poetical Works of W. Sh. (T. Wilson, etc.)

Malone text of 1780; a few peculiar readings.

1807. Poems of Sh., to which is added an account of his life. First American edition. Boston. (Oliver & Munroe, etc.)

The 1640 arrangement. As to its being the first American edition, see note under 1796.

1809. Poems of W. Sh. Boston. (Munroe, Francis, & Parker.)

The 1640 arrangement.

[1820.] The Poems of W. Sh., with three engravings. (J. F. Dove.)

Another edition, dated 1830. The Malone text.

1821. Miscellaneous Poems of W. Sh. (Sherwin & Co.)

The Malone text.

1821. Plays and Poems of W. Sh., with the corrections and illustrations of various commentators [etc.]. [James Boswell.] (Rivington, etc.)

Volume 20 of Boswell's Malone (the "third Variorum"). The Malone text and notes of 1790, with a few corrections and additions.

1822. Sonnets of W. Sh., to which are added his minor poems and the songs from his plays. Whitehaven. (Steel.)

1825. Poems of W. Sh. (Pickering.)

Jaggard lists another edition, in 1826, uniform with Pickering's Shakespeare of that year.

1826. An Appendix to Sh.'s Dramatic Works. Leipsic. (Fleischer.)

Contains the Poems and Sonnets, as a supplement to the Fleischer edition of the Plays; with Glossary.

[1830?] Poems and Songs of W. Sh. The Standard Poets, volume IV. (Strange.)

1832. Poems of Sh. Aldine edition. [A. Dyce.] (Pickering.)

Memoir and footnotes; a newly revised text. Other issues in 1842, etc.

1834. Plays and Poems of Sh. [1832–34.] A. J. Valpy. (Valpy.)

Sonnets in volume 15; notes. Valpy's notes were reprinted in the Bohn ed. of Sh.'s Poetical Works, 1862, etc.

[1837.] Poetical Works of W. Sh. Campe's edition. Nurnberg and New York. (Campe.)

1838. Poems of W. Sh., with facts connected with his life [etc.]. Knight's Cabinet edition. (Knight.)

Life, and footnotes, by Charles Knight. The text follows the Aldine, with a few exceptions. Other issues in 1842, etc.

1840. Poems of W. Sh. (Moxon.)

1840. Poems of W. Sh. (L. A. Lewis.) [A few footnotes.]

1841. Poems of W. Sh. (Daly.)

Another issue, without date, but about 1850.

1843. Pictorial Edition of the Works of Sh. [1838–43.] Edited by Charles Knight. (Knight.)

Sonnets in volume 6. Notes, and an essay called Illustration of the Sonnets, which was widely reprinted elsewhere without acknowledgment.

1844. Works of W. Sh. Edited by J. P. Collier. (Whittaker.)

Sonnets in volume 8. Introduction and notes. Other editions in 1858 and 1878.

1851. Poems of W. Sh. Philadelphia. (Locker.)

1852. Supplementary Works of W. Sh., comprising his poems and doubtful plays [etc.]. A new edition by W. Hazlitt. (Routledge.)

Supplementary to Hazlitt's revision of the 1778 edition of the Plays. Preface and footnotes.

1852. Poems of W. Sh. Hartford. (Andrus.)

1855. Poems of W. Sh. Edited by Robert Bell. Annotated edition of the English Poets.

Introduction and footnotes. Other issues in 1861, etc.

[1855.] Poems of W. Sh. Philadelphia. (J. B. Smith.)

1856. Sh.'s Werke, herausgegeben und erklärt von N. Delius. Elberfeld.

Sonnets in volume 7. Other editions in 1864 and 1872. There also appeared at Leipzig, in 1854 and again in 1864, a one-volume edition of Sh.'s Works (entirely in English), which is usually listed as Delius's, the Preface being signed "Dr. D." The text of the Sonnets in this edition is full of errors, and can hardly have been revised by Delius; it also presents a new arrangement (see p. 437 above), which may be based on his view of the Sonnets as impersonal literary performances.

1856. Works of W. Sh. [1851–56.] Edited by H. N. Hudson. Boston. (Munroe.)

Sonnets in volume 11. Introduction and notes. A new edition (Harvard edition), 1880–81, with the Sonnets in volume 20.

1856. Poetical Works of W. Sh. and the Earl of Surrey; with Memoirs, Critical Dissertations, and Explanatory Notes, by the Rev. George Gilfillan. British Poets. Edinburgh. (Nichol.)

Footnotes. Another issue in 1878, in Cassell's Library.

1856. Poems of Sh., with Memoir by A. Dyce, and a few corrections [etc.]. Boston. (Little, Brown & Co.)

A revision of the Aldine edition, made by F. J. Child. Other issues in 1864, etc.

1857. Works of Sh., edited by A. Dyce. (Moxon.)

Sonnets in volume 6. Textual notes. Other editions in 1866 and 1875.

1858. Poems of Sh. (C. Little.)

1860. Works of W. Sh., edited by H. Staunton. (Routledge.)

Sonnets in volume 4; introduction and footnotes. Another issue in 1864.

1864. Works of Sh. Edited, with a scrupulous revision of the text, by Charles and Mary Cowden Clarke. (Bickers.)

1864. Works of W. Sh. Edited by W. G. Clark and W. A. Wright. Globe edition. (Macmillan.)

Text based on that of the (still unfinished) Cambridge edition, but not identical with it. Other issues in 1865, etc.

1865. Plays and Poems of W. Sh. Edited by Thos. Keightley. (Bell & Daldy.)

A newly revised text.

1865. Works of W. Sh., . . . the text formed from a new collation of the early editions, etc. [Folio; 1853–65.] J. O. Halliwell. (Printed for the editor.)

Sonnets in volume 16; introduction and notes.

1865. Songs and Sonnets by W. Sh. [Edited by F. T. Palgrave.] (Macmillan.)

Various subsequent issues; later called the Golden Treasury edition. Introduction, notes, and new titles for the Sonnets; a few omitted.

1865. Sh.'s Works. Edited by R. G. White. Boston. (Little, Brown & Co.)

Sonnets in volume 1; introduction and notes. A revised edition (Riverside Sh.) in 1883.

1866. Works of W. Sh. [1863–66.] Edited by W. G. Clark and W. A. Wright. Cambridge edition. (Macmillan.)

Sonnets in volume 9. Textual notes. Revised edition, edited by Wright only, in 1891–93.

1877. The Leopold Sh. (Cassell.)

The Delius text; introduction by F. J. Furnivall, treating of the Sonnets in § 11.

1885. Sh.'s Poems, 1640. (A. R. Smith.)

The only modern reprint of the 1640 text; "printed letter for letter, line for line, and page for page, as near the original as modern type will permit" (but with some errors).

1885. Songs, Poems, and Sonnets of Sh. With introduction by William Sharp. Newcastle. (Walter Scott.)

Introduction and notes. Issued (in the Canterbury Poets) from London in 1888 and thereafter.

1889. Poems and Sonnets of W. Sh. Chiswick Series. (Bell.)

1890. Works of W. Sh. Edited by Henry Irving and Frank A. Marshall. The Henry Irving Sh. (Blackie.)

Sonnets in volume 8. Introduction and notes by A. W. Verity.

1891. Works of Sh. Edited by W. J. Craig. Oxford Edition. Oxford. (Clarendon Press.)

Another issue in 1902.

1893. Poems of W. Sh., printed after the original copies. [Edited by F. S. Ellis.] (Kelmscott Press.)

The 1609 text, with some emendations and modern punctuation.

1898. Poems of Sh. Edited with an Introduction and Notes by George Wyndham. (Methuen.)

1898. Sonnets and Poems by W. Sh. Pocket Falstaff edition [of the Works]. (Sands.)

1899. Poems of W. Sh., according to the text of the original copies. . . . Collated by F. S. Ellis, and printed at the Essex House Press.

The 1609 text, with some emendations and modern punctuation.

1900. Works of Sh. Edited by C. H. Herford. Eversley edition. (Macmillan.)

Sonnets in volume 10. Introduction and footnotes.

1903. Poems and Sonnets of Sh., with an introduction by E. Dowden. (Kegan Paul.)

In part the same introduction as that in Dowden's edition of the Sonnets (see I, 1881).

[1904.] Poems and Songs of Sh. Newnes' Pocket Classics.

1905. Sonnets and Poems by W. Sh., with bibliographical introduction by H. Bennett. Carlton Classics. (Long.)

1905. Sonnets and Poems by W. Sh. Waistcoat Pocket edition. (Treherne.)

1906. Poems. Edited by E. K. Chambers. Red Letter Shakespeare. (Blackie.)

Sonnets in volume 2; introduction and footnotes.

1906. Sh.'s Complete Works. Edited by W. A. Neilson. The Cambridge Poets. Boston. (Houghton Mifflin.)

New text, and brief introduction to the Sonnets.

1907. Works of W. Sh. Stratford Town edition. Stratford-on-Avon. (Printed for A. H. Bullen and F. Sidgwick.)

Sonnets in volume 10; essay on them (pp. 363–72) by H. C. Beeching.

[1908.] W. Sh., Poems, Songs, and Sonnets. (Sisley.)

Biography by C. Mortemart; footnotes.

[1908.] Complete Works of W. Sh. Sidney Lee, General Editor. The Renaissance Sh. (Harrap.)

Sonnets in volume 38, with introduction by John Davidson and notes by Lee. This edition has also appeared under various other names and imprints, as the Caxton and (in the U.S.) the Harper.

[1911.] Sonnets and Poems. Edited by H. N. Hudson. The Era Sh.
Introduction and footnotes from the Hudson Sh.

1912. Sonnets and Minor Poems by Sh. Edited by Charlotte Porter. The First Folio Sh. New York. (Crowell.)
A scrupulous reprint of the quarto text of 1609; introduction and notes.

III. TRANSLATIONS

(*a*) *German*

1820. Sh.'s Sonette, übersetzt von Karl Lachmann. Berlin.
[Certain of the Sonnets were translated by Tieck in 1826; see under V, 1826.]

1827. W. Sh.'s sämmtliche Gedichte. E. V. Bauernfeld und A. Schumacher. (Sonette, übersetzt von A. Schumacher.) Wien.

1836. Sh.-Almanach. Herausgegeben von Gottlob Regis. I. W. Sh.'s Lyrische Gedichte. Sonnette &c. Berlin.
Introduction and notes; the former chiefly from Drake (see VI, 1817).

1840. W. Sh.'s sämmtliche Gedichte, übersetzt von Emil Wagner. (*With* W. Sh.'s sämmtliche dramatische Werke, A. W. von Schlegel und Tieck.) Königsberg.
Introduction.

1840. Nachträge zu Sh.'s Werken von Schlegel und Tieck. Uebersetzt von Ernst Ortlepp. Stuttgart.
Sonnets in volume 3.

1861. Sh.'s Gedichte. Deutsch von Wilhelm Jordan. Berlin.
Introduction and a few notes; the Sonnets divided into five "books."

1862. W. Sh.'s Sonette in deutscher Nachbildung. F. Bodenstedt. Berlin.
Introduction, notes, and appendix. A new arrangement. Later editions in 1866, etc.

1867. Sh.'s Gedichte. Deutsch von Karl Simrock. Stuttgart.
Preface.

1867. Sh.'s Sonette, übersetzt von F. A. Gelbcke.
Introduction, following Massey (see IV, 1866); the Sonnets rearranged accordingly. The translation reappeared in volume 10 of *Sh. in deutscher Uebersetzung*, Bibliothek ausländischer Klassiker, Hildburghausen, 1871.

1869. Sh.'s Sonette. Uebersetzt von Herm. Freiherr von Friesen. Dresden.

1870. Sh.'s Sonette, Deutsch von Bruno Tschischwitz. Halle.
Introduction and a few notes.

[1870.] Sh.'s kleinere Dichtungen, Deutsch von Alex. Neidhardt. (Classiker des In- und Auslandes.) Berlin.

Introduction and footnotes. Another edition, Leipzig, 1902.

1871. Sh.'s Sonette, übersetzt von Otto Gildemeister. Leipzig.

Introduction and notes, developing Delius's fiction theory. A second edition in 1876.

1872. Sh.'s Southampton-Sonette. Deutsch von Fritz Krauss. Leipzig.

Sonnets 1–126, arranged according to Massey's interpretation, after correspondence between him and the translator; introduction and notes also based largely on Massey.

[Certain of the Sonnets were translated by F. A. Leo, *Gedichte*, Berlin, 1872, p. 226.]

1875. Probe einer Uebersetzung Shakespearscher Sonette. Dr. Guttmann. Hirschberg. (Gymnasium Programm.)

31 sonnets translated.

[1894.] Gedichte von W. Sh., in's Deutsche übertragen durch Alfred von Mauntz. Berlin.

Introduction and notes; a new arrangement of the Sonnets.

*1903. Sh.'s Sonette, übersetzt von M. J. Wolff. Berlin.

Introduction, etc.; reviewed in *Jahrbuch*, 40: 295.

*1909. Sh.'s Sonette; Umdichtung von Stephan George. Berlin. [*Jahrbuch*, 46: 266.]

*1909. Sh.'s Sonette, übertragen von Eduard Saenger. Leipzig. [*Jahrbuch*, 46: 266.]

*1910. Die schönsten Sonette von W. Sh. Uebersetzt und erläutert von A. Baltzer. Wismar.

Reviewed in *Archiv für den neueren Sprachen*, 124: 217.

1913. Sh.'s Sonette, erläutert von Alois Brandl, übersetzt von Ludwig Fulda. Stuttgart & Berlin.

Introduction.

(*b*) *French*

1836. Poèmes et Sonnets de W. Sh., traduits en vers, avec le texte anglais. E. Lafond. Paris.

Forty-eight selected sonnets. Another edition in 1856.

1857. Les Sonnets de W. Sh., traduits pour la première fois en entier, par F. Victor Hugo. Paris.

Prose translation. Introduction and notes; a new arrangement of the Sonnets. The translation was included in Hugo's *Oeuvres Complètes de Sh.*, 1859–66.

1860–62. Oeuvres Complètes de Sh. F. Guizot. Paris.

Prose translation.

1873. Oeuvres Complètes de Sh., traduites par Emile Montégut. Paris.
Prose translation.

1888. Les Sonnets de Sh., traduits en vers français, par Alfred Copin. Paris.
Introduction; Sonnets rearranged in six parts.

1891. W. Sh., son Poème, les Sonnets. Traduit par Louis Direy. Poverty Bay, New Zealand. [The Phœnix and the Turtle also included.]
Preface.

1900. Les Sonnets de Sh., traduits en sonnets français, avec Introduction, Notes, et Bibliographie. Fernand Henry. Paris.
English text given also. A fairly full bibliography.

1906–07. Les Sonnets de Sh. Essai d'une Interprétation en vers français. C. M. Garnier. *Cahiers de la Quinzaine*, Paris, Dec. 23, 1906 and March 31, 1907.
Sonnets 1–152.

(*c*) *Italian*

1890. I Sonetti di W. Sh. Tradotti per la prima volta in Italiano, da Angelo Olivieri. Palermo.
Prose translation; introduction and notes.

1898. I 154 Sonetti di G. Sh. Tradotti in Sonetti Italiani da Ettore Sanfelice. Velletri.
Introduction.

1909. G. Sh., I Sonetti. Traduzione italiana, con introduzione e noti di Lucifero Darchini. Milano.
Prose translation.

(*d*) *Swedish*

[1871.] W. Sh. Sonetter, på svenska återgifna af Carl Rupert Nyblom. Upsala.
Introduction and notes.

(*e*) *Danish*

1885. Sh. Sonetter, oversatte af Adolf Hansen. Med Indledning og Anmaerkninger. Copenhagen.
Introduction and notes.

(*f*) *Dutch*

1879. Sh. Sonetten, vertaald door Dr. L. A. J. Burgersdijk. Utrecht.
Introduction and notes; a new arrangement.

(*g*) *Spanish*

*1877. Obras de W. Sh., traducidas fielmente del original inglés, por D. Matías de Velasco y Rojas, Marqués de Dos Hermanas. [Volume 1:] Poemas y Sonetos. Madrid.

Prose translation, with "Estudio sobre los sonetos" and notes; see *Jahrbuch*, 14: 393.

(*h*) *Russian*

*1880. [W. Sh.'s collected Sonnets, translated by Nicolai Gerbel. St. Petersburg.] [*Jahrbuch*, 16: 472.]

[Twenty of the Sonnets are to be found translated into Polish, in *Poeci Angielscy*, by J. Kasprowicz, Lemberg, 1907.]

(*i*) *Hungarian*

*[1909.] Sh. Szonettjeiböl. Fordította. Zoltán Vilmos. Budapest. [*Jahrbuch*, 46: 369.]

(*j*) *Latin*

1913. Gulielmi Sh. Carmina quae Sonnets nuncupantur Latine reddita ab Alvredo Thoma Barton; edenda curavit J. Harrower.

IV. BOOKS AND MONOGRAPHS

1837. J. Boaden: On the Sonnets of Sh., identifying the person to whom they are addressed, and elucidating several points in the poet's history.

62 pp.; a revision of the articles in *The Gentleman's Magazine* (see V, 1832).

1838. C. A. Brown: Sh.'s Autobiographical Poems. Being his Sonnets clearly developed [etc.].

Groups the Sonnets in six "Poems."

1860. D. Barnstorff: Schlüssel zu Sh.'s Sonetten. Bremen.

Translated by T. J. Graham, as "A Key to Sh.'s Sonnets," 1862. Esoteric.

1862. Bolton Corney: The Sonnets of Sh.; a critical disquisition.

16 pp.; based on Chasles's "discovery" regarding the Dedication (see pp. 6–7).

1865. [E. A. Hitchcock:] Remarks on the Sonnets of Sh., showing that they belong to the hermetic class of writings, and explaining their general meaning and purpose. New York.

Esoteric. An enlarged edition in 1867.

1866. Gerald Massey: Sh.'s Sonnets never before Interpreted.

Enlarged from an article in the *Quarterly Review* (see V, 1864); on the "dramatic" theory of the Sonnets, according to which

many of them were written on behalf of Southampton and Elizabeth Vernon. An enlarged edition in 1872.

1868. R. Simpson: Introduction to the Philosophy of Sh.'s Sonnets.

An essay on Sh.'s use of the platonic and neo-platonic doctrine of love. First printed in *The Chronicle*.

1870. Henry Brown: The Sonnets of Sh. Solved, and the mystery of his friendship, love, and rivalry revealed.

Views a large portion of the Sonnets as satires on the sonnet fashion; groups them in 57 sections.

1872. C. M. Ingleby: The Soule Arayed; a letter to Howard Staunton, Esq., concerning Sh.'s Sonnet 146.

16 pp. Reprinted in the author's volume, *Sh., the Man and the Book*, 1877.

1877. E. Lichtenberger: De Carminibus Shaksperi, cum nova Thorpianae Inscriptioni Interpretatione. Paris.

A thesis; with special reference to the Dedication.

1888. Gerald Massey: The Secret Drama of Sh.'s Sonnets.

Further development of his theory (see under 1866), with replies to critics.

1890. L. Direy: William Sh., his poem, sonnets and dedication. Poverty Bay, New Zealand.

18 pp.; esoteric.

1891. L. de Marchi: I Sonetti di Sh. Milan.

An essay, including translations of eleven of the Sonnets.

1892. "Clelia" [C. Downing]: Great Pan Lives! Sh.'s Sonnets, 20–126.

Esoteric.

1897. E. J. Dunning: The Genesis of Sh.'s Art; a Study of his Sonnets and Poems. Boston.

Esoteric. An Appendix on the use of "you" and "thou" in the Sonnets.

1897. E. Freiherr von Danckelmann: Sh. in seinen Sonetten. Leipzig.

23 pp.; discusses the man-friendship as of an ideal, platonic character.

1898. T. Tyler: The Herbert-Fitton Theory of Sh.'s Sonnets; a Reply.

23 pp.; a defence of the Pembroke theory in reply to critics.

1899. Cuming Walters: The Mystery of Sh.'s Sonnets.

Views the sonnets as studies of the themes of the dramas, partially personal but largely allegorical.

1899. J. Johnson: The Testimony of the Sonnets as to the Authorship of the Shakespearean Plays and Poems. New York.

Views the sonnets as studies of an older man than Sh.

1900. Parke Godwin: A New Study of the Sonnets of Sh. New York.

Esoteric.

1902. Jean I. O'Flanagan: Sh.'s Self-Revelation in his Sonnets. Stratford-on-Avon.

38 pp.

1903. Arthur Acheson: Sh. and the Rival Poet.

Devoted chiefly to the identification of the "rival poet" as Chapman.

1903. T. Eichhoff: Unser Sh.: . . . II: (1) Sh.'s Sonette und ihr Wert; (2) Die Sonettensatire. Halle.

Views the Sonnets as constituting a miscellany by many authors, relatively valueless.

1904. J. M.: Sh. Self-Revealed in his Sonnets and Phœnix and Turtle.

Esoteric. Followed [no date] by a pamphlet of 4 pp., called "A Recantation," in which each of the 36 italicised words in the 1609 Quarto is treated as a symbol of one of the Shakespearean plays.

[1904.] E. A. Jackson: A Consideration of Sh.'s Sonnets.

16 pp.

1909. Anna B. MacMahan: Sh.'s Love Story. Chicago.

The principal Sonnets interpreted as addressed to Anne Hathaway.

1912. George H. Palmer: Intimations of Immortality in the Sonnets of Sh. Boston.

Views the Sonnets as concerned with various types of immortality, with S. 146 as the climax.

[1912.] R. M. Garrett: Materials for the Study of Sh.'s Sonnets. Seattle.

A syllabus for the use of students at the University of Washington.

1913. Arthur Acheson: Mistress Davenant, the Dark Lady of Sh.'s Sonnets.

Further develops the author's work of 1903, identifying the "dark lady" as Mistress Jane Davenant of Oxford.

[1913.] A. Acheson: A Woman Coloured Ill.

16 pages. Supplemental to the preceding item.

*1913. P. Rödder: Sh.'s Sonette im Lichte der neueren Forschungen. Königsberg.

Programm-Dissertation.

1913. Countess de Chambrun [Clara Longworth de Chambrun]: The Sonnets of W. Sh.; New Light and Old Evidence. New York.

Follows Acheson in the Mistress Davenant theory.

1915. Sydney Kent: The People in Sh.'s Sonnets.

General and conjectural; favors a very early date; identifies W. H. as Southampton and the Dark Lady as one (hypothetical) Alice Bird.

V. ARTICLES IN SERIALS

[Book reviews are not included, except when of independent interest.]

1818. "Proh Pudor!": On Sh.'s Sonnets, *Blackwood's Magazine*, 3: 585.

Appreciative criticism, with an attack on Hazlitt.

*1826. L. Tieck: Ueber Sh.'s Sonette einige Worte, nebst Proben einer Uebersetzung derselben. *Penelope Taschenbuch*, Leipzig, p. 314.

See Goedeke's *Grundriss*, 6: 40; § 284, 1, 84.

1832. J. B[oaden]: To what Person the Sonnets of Sh. were actually addressed. *Gentleman's Magazine*, 102: 216, 308.

The first exposition of the Pembroke theory. The prior "discovery" of this solution was announced by B. H. Bright in the October number of the *Magazine* (p. 296). Boaden's articles were issued in a reprint (see IV, 1837).

1834. Armand Morlaix [*pseud.* for A. F. L. de Wailly]: Les Sonnets de Sh. *Revue des deux Mondes*, 3d ser., 4: 679.

1834. D. L. Richardson: Sh.'s Sonnets: on their poetical merits, and on the question of to whom are they addressed. *Literary Gazette*, Calcutta, April 5.

Reprinted in the author's *Literary Leaves*, Calcutta, 1836.

1847. [H. W. Barrett:] Sh.'s Sonnets, *American Review*, 6: 304.

General biographic interpretation.

1857. Anon.: The Sonnets of Sh. *Westminster Review*, 68: 116.

Discussion of the autobiographical elements as related to poetic beauty.

1859. J. G. R.: [On S. 107 and Southampton], *Notes & Queries*, 2d s., 7: 125.

1861. D. Asher: [Review of Barnstorff's work (see IV, 1860)], *Magazin für Literatur des Auslandes*, 30: 476.

Reviews also the general literature of the subject.

1862. P. Chasles: Hints for the Elucidation of Sh.'s Sonnets, *Athenæum*, Jan. 25, p. 116.

A new interpretation of the Dedication (see p. 6). Comment by R. Cartwright followed in the number for Feb. 1, p. 155.

1862. B. Corney: M. Philarète Chasles, *Notes & Queries*, 3d s., 1: 87.

Applies Chasles's view of the Dedication to the Southampton theory.

1862. B. Corney: The Sonnets of Sh., *Notes & Queries*, 3d s., 1: 162.

Discusses date, relation to Southampton, etc.

1862. J. A. Heraud: A New View of Sh.'s Sonnets, *Temple Bar*, 5: 53.

Esoteric. Reprinted as appendix to the author's *Sh., his Inner Life as Intimated in his Works*, 1865.

1862. [W. R. Alger:] Sh.'s Sonnets and Friendship, *Christian Examiner*, Boston, 73: 209, 403.

Argument for the Pembroke theory.

1864. F. Kreyssig: Sh.'s lyrische Gedichte und ihre neuesten Bearbeiter, *Preussische Jahrbücher*, 13: 484; 14: 91.

A review of the Jordan and Bodenstedt translations; discusses the biographical element in the Sonnets and Sh.'s morality.

1864. [G. Massey:] Sh. and his Sonnets, *Quarterly Review*, 115: 431.

Develops the writer's "dramatic" theory (see IV, 1866).

1865. N. Delius: Ueber Sh.'s Sonette, *Jahrbuch*, 1: 18.

Presents the "fiction" theory.

1865. W. C. Hazlitt: Sh.'s Sonnets; Mr. W. H., *Notes & Queries*, 3d s., 8: 449.

Identifies W. H. as William Hammond; a reply by B. Corney, p. 482.

1866. R. Bell: Sh.'s Sonnets, *Fortnightly Review*, 5: 734.

A review of Massey's book (IV, 1866); discusses Southampton and Pembroke theories.

1867. P. Chasles: Sh.'s Sonnets, *Athenæum*, Feb. 16, p. 223.

Abandons Pembroke theory for William Hathaway. In the number for Feb. 23 (p. 254) S. Neil calls attention to his earlier proposal of the same theory in his biography of Sh. (see VI, 1861). Chasles rejoins in the number for March 9, p. 323.

1867. G. Massey: Sh.'s Sonnets, *Athenæum*, Mar. 16, p. 355.

On the meaning of "begetter."

1867. P. Chasles: Sh.'s Sonnets, *Athenæum*, Apr. 13, p. 486.

Further defence of his view of the Dedication, with reply to Massey. Rejoinders follow by Massey and Neil in the number for Apr. 27, p. 551; the latter summarizing all the conjectures regarding Mr. W. H. A final reply by Chasles in the number for May 18, p. 662.

1869. B. Nicholson: Sh.'s 77th Sonnet, *Notes & Queries*, 4th s., 3: 166.

1869. H. Freiherr von Friesen: Ueber Sh.'s Sonette, *Jahrbuch*, 4: 94.

Opposes the Pembroke theory, and the views of Massey and Delius; discusses the relation of the Sonnets to Sh.'s morality.

*1871. Anon.: Sh.'s Sonette und die deutschen Uebersetzer, *Magazin für die Literatur des Auslandes*, No. 73. [*Jahrbuch*, 8: 393.]

1873. [Report of a paper by C. M. Ingleby, before the Royal Society of Literature,] *Athenæum*, July 5, p. 18.

Favors Brae's theory that W. H. is a misprint for W. S. Reply by S. N. (Neil?) in the number for Aug. 2, p. 147.

1873. C. E. Browne: Sh.'s Sonnets, an Old Theory, *Athenæum*, Aug. 30, p. 277.

On the "Hews" of S. 20 and persons of that name. A note from Ingleby follows on p. 306, and a further note by Browne on p. 335.

1873. C. Edmonds: A Shakspearean Discovery, *Athenæum*, Oct. 25, p. 528, and Nov. 22, p. 661.
On a certain W. H. Replies by C. E. Browne on pp. 563, 771.

1873–74. H. Staunton: Unsuspected Corruptions of Sh.'s Text, *Athenæum*, Dec. 3, p. 731; Jan. 3, p. 20; Jan. 31, p. 160; Mar. 14, p. 357.
Various emendations.

1874. Jabez: A Sh. Myth Exploded, *Notes & Queries*, 5th s., 1: 80.
On the inference from Sonnets 37 and 89 that Sh. was lame.

1875. F. G. Fleay: The Motive of Sh.'s Sonnets: a defence of his Morality, *Macmillan's Magazine*, 31: 433.
Sonnets 1–126 interpreted as a poem in defence of Sh.'s profession.

1875. F. J. Furnivall: Sonnet, 146, 2, *Academy*, Sept. 11, p. 282.
An emendation.

1876. F. J. F[urnivall]: The W. H. or Will of Sh.'s Sonnets, *Notes & Queries*, 5th s., 5: 443.
Gives a list of persons named Hews or Hughes.

1875. K. Hillard: On the Study of Sh.'s Sonnets, *Lippincott's Magazine*, 15: 497.
Reviews the controversy, developing the autobiographic interpretation.

1875. Speriend: Sh.'s Lameness, *Notes & Queries*, 5th s., 3: 134.
A reply to "Jabez" (see under 1874 above), who replies on p. 278; a further note by "Speriend," p. 497.

1875. K. Elze: Sh.'s Character, seine Welt- und Lebensanschauung, *Jahrbuch*, 10: 75.
The Sonnets discussed (pp. 81–90) on the lines followed in the writer's book (see under VI, 1876).

1876. R. H. Legis: Identification of Michael Drayton with the Rival Poet of Sh.'s Sonnets, *Notes & Queries*, 5th s., 6: 163.

1876. E. D. Stone: Sh.'s 18th Sonnet, *Notes & Queries*, 5th s., 5: 463.
A Latin translation of the sonnet.

1876. R. H. Legis: Thorpe's Prefix to Sh.'s Sonnets, *Notes & Queries*, 5th s., 6: 421.
An esoteric interpretation of the Dedication.

1877. J. W. Hales: From Stratford to London, *Cornhill Magazine*, 35: 69.
Incidental consideration of Sh.'s allusions to his journeys.

1877. R. H. Legis: Sonnet 86, *Notes & Queries*, 5th s., 7: 244.
On Drayton and the *Polyolbion* in relation to the Sonnets.

1877. R. H. Legis: The 126th of Sh.'s Sonnets, *Notes & Queries*, 5th s., 7: 261.
Esoteric interpretation of this sonnet and the series generally. Reply by R. M. Spence, p. 324.

1877. Jabez: Sonnet 86, *Notes & Queries*, 5th s., 7: 283.
On the reading *filled: filed*. Rejoinder by Legis on p. 384, and again by "Jabez" on p. 465.

1877. K. Gödeke: Ueber die Sonette Sh.'s, *Deutsche Rundschau*, 10: 386.
Views the collection as a medley, addressed to various persons.

1877. A. E. Brae: Sh.'s Sonnet 116, *Lippincott's Magazine*, 19: 761.

1878. W. Hertzberg: Eine griechische Quelle zu Sh.'s Sonetten, *Jahrbuch*, 13: 158.
On the source of Sonnets 153–54.

1878. T. A. Spalding: Sh.'s Sonnets, *Gentleman's Magazine*, 242: 300.
Sonnets 1–126 discussed as the story of a friendship.

1878. G. Tirinelli: I Sonetti di Sh., *Nuova Antologia*, 2d ser., 8: 228.
General discussion of the biographical problem.

1878–79. H. Isaac: Zu den Sonetten Sh.'s, *Archiv für den neueren Sprachen*, 59: 155, 241; 60: 33; 61: 177, 393; 62: 1, 129.
A commentary on those sonnets which the writer views as dealing with love; Bodenstedt's order followed.

1879. Bibliothecary: The Crux of Sonnet 116, *Notes & Queries*, 5th s., 12: 24.
On the meaning of "hight." Replies by B. Nicholson and "B. C.," on p. 250 of 6th s., vol. 1.

1879. L. A. J. Burgersdijk: Zu Sonett 121, *Jahrbuch*, 14: 363.

1879. F. Krauss: Sh. und seine Sonette, *Nord und Süd*, 8: 226.
Follows Massey's theory.

1880. T. Tyler: The Date of Sh.'s 55th Sonnet, *Athenæum*, Sept. 11, p. 337.

1880. A. C. Swinburne: Short Notes on English Poets, *Fortnightly Review*, 34: 708.
Reviews W. M. Rossetti's criticism (see VI, 1878); replies to Browning's objection to the autobiographical theory. Reprinted in the writer's *Miscellanies*, 1886.

1880. S. S. Travers: Sh.'s Sonnets: to whom were they addressed? *Victorian Review*, December.
Interprets the sonnets as addressed to an illegitimate son of Sh. Reprinted as a pamphlet, Tasmania, 1881.

1880. Anon.: A Talk about Sonnets, *Blackwood's Magazine*, 128: 159.
Sh.'s Sonnets discussed, pp. 163–67.

1880. C. E. Browne: The Play upon "You" and "Hews" in the Sonnets, and its relation to the Herberts, *Notes & Queries*, 6th s., 1: 210.
On Herbert's title of Lord Fitzhugh.

1880. F. J. Furnivall: An Early MS. Copy of Sh.'s 8th Sonnet, *Academy*, Dec. 24, p. 462.
On Add. MS. 15226.

1881. F. Krauss: Die schwarze Schöne der Sh.-Sonette, *Jahrbuch*, 16: 144.
Develops Massey's interpretation of the later sonnets as concerned with Pembroke and Lady Rich.

1881. E. Stengel: Bilden die ersten 126 Sonette Sh.'s einen Sonettcyclus, und welches ist die ursprüngliche Reihenfolge derselben? *Englische Studien*, 4: 1.

1882. H. Isaac: Wie weit geht die Abhängigkeit Sh.'s von Daniel als Lyriker? *Jahrbuch*, 17: 165.

1883. B. Nicholson: Sonnet 113 and The Phœnix and Turtle, *Athenæum*, Feb. 3, p. 150.
The same note (on the interpretation of line 14) contributed to *Notes & Queries*, 6th s., 7: 464.

1883. J. Crosby: The Crux in Sonnet 126, *Literary World*, 14: 64.

1884. J. H. Browne: Sh.'s Sonnets in a New Light, *Manhattan*, 3: 145.
A favorable account of Massey's theory.

1884. C. Mackay: A Tangled Skein Unraveled, *Nineteenth Century*, 16: 238.
The Sonnets divided into six groups; some viewed as the work of Marlowe, Pembroke, and others.

1884. H. Isaac: Sh.'s Selbstbekenntnisse, *Preussische Jahrbücher*, 54: 237, 313.
Further develops the writer's views of 1878–79 and of the *Jahrbuch* article (see preceding item); Sh.'s spiritual biography outlined from the Sonnets; arguments for Spenser and Marlowe as rival poets.

1884. [W. J. Rolfe:] New Theories of the Sonnets, *Shakespeariana*, 1: 291.
An account of the recent articles in *Blackwood's* and of Mackay's in the *Nineteenth Century*.

1884. H. Isaac: Die Sonett-Periode in Sh.'s Leben, *Jahrbuch*, 19: 176.
Classifies the Sonnets according to themes, and considers the probable dates on the basis of parallels with the plays.

1884. T. Tyler: The Imprisonment of Lord Pembroke in 1601, *Academy*, March 22, p. 204.
Pembroke in relation to certain of the Sonnets.

1884. T. Tyler: Sh. and Lords Pembroke and Southampton, *Academy*, Apr. 19, p. 280.

1884. W. A. Harrison: The Dark Lady and Mistress Mary Fitton, *Academy*, July 5 and 12, pp. 9, 30.

1884. T. Tyler: Mrs. Fytton and Rosaline in Love's Labour 's Lost, *Academy*, July 19, p. 47.

1884. W. E. A. Axon: Mrs. Mary Fitton, *Academy*, July 26, p. 62.

1884. A. Hall: A Literary Craze, *Notes & Queries*, 6th s., 10: 21, 61, 101, 181.
Primarily a reply to the first of the *Blackwood* articles on Sh. and Dante (see following item); discusses Elizabethan dedications, and proposes Nash as the rival poet.

1884–86. Anon.: New Views of Sh.'s Sonnets: the Other Poet Identified, *Blackwood's Magazine*, 135: 727; 137: 774; 139: 327.

Proposes Dante as the "rival poet"; discusses Sh.'s medieval sources.

1885. T. Tyler: Sh. and Lord Pembroke, *Academy*, June 20, p. 438.

1885. W. A. Harrison: Die "dunkle Dame" in Sh.'s Sonetten und Mrs. Mary Fitton, *Jahrbuch*, 20: 327.

The same matter as in Harrison's *Academy* letters of 1884.

1885. J. G. B.: "Looks" or "Books" in Sonnet 23, *Shakespeariana*, 2: 495.

1885. A. Morgan: Much Ado about Sonnets, *Catholic World*, 42: 212.

General discussion, emphasizing the uneven merit of the Sonnets, and distrusting all biographic interpretations. Reprinted in the writer's *Sh. in Fact and in Criticism*, 1888.

1886. E. Dowden: Sh.'s Sonnets, *Academy*, Jan. 30, p. 67.

A review of Tyler's introduction to the Praetorius facsimile.

1886. Anon.: [Review of the Praetorius Facsimile Quarto and the Canterbury Edition of the Sonnets,] *Athenæum*, Feb. 20, p. 257.

Discusses the autobiographical problem, and the Fitton theory.

1887. T. Bayne: Sonnet 66, *Notes & Queries*, 7th s., 4: 304.

Proposes an emendation of "disabled." Discussed by D. C. T., C. B. M., and R. F. Gardiner, p. 405, and by B. Nicholson, 5: 61.

1887. G. Garrigues: Sh.'s Sonnets, *Journal of Speculative Philosophy*, 21: 241.

Esoteric.

1888. T. Tyler: Mrs. Mary Fitton and Sh.'s 152nd Sonnet, *Academy*, Dec. 15, p. 388.

1888. F. A. Leo: Hilfsmittel bei Untersuchungen über Sh.'s Sonette, *Jahrbuch*, 23: 304.

Gives a classification of the Sonnets and an index of topics.

1888. Horace Davis: Sh.'s Sonnets, *Overland Monthly*, San Francisco, n.s., 11: 248.

Interprets the Sonnets in connection with the plays.

1889. W. J. Rolfe: The Sonnets, *Shakespeariana*, 6: 97.

General; the same matter as in the author's edition of the Sonnets and *Life of Sh.*

1889. E. H. Plumptre: Sh.'s Travels, Somerset and Elsewhere, *Contemporary Review*, 55: 584.

On Sonnets 153–154, as evidence that Sh. had been at Bath; with discussion of the alleged connection of the Sonnets with *Willobie his Avisa.*

1889. T. Tyler: Sh. and Marston in 1598, *Academy*, May 4, p. 306.

On Sonnet 32, line 12.

1889. Anon.: Sh.'s Sonnets and Mary Fitton, *Academy*, Oct. 5, p. 220.

1889. T. Tyler: Mary Fitton and the Dictionary of National Biography, *Athenæum*, Oct. 19, p. 531.

1889. T. W. Norwood: Mary Fitton, *Athenæum*, Nov. 9, p. 643.

1889. B. N[icholson]: Was Sh. Lame? *Notes & Queries*, 7th s., 8: 454.
In reply to a query by W. Blood (p. 367).

1889. C. W. Franklyn: William Sh., Gentleman, *Westminster Review*, 132: 348.
Doubts the Shakspearean authorship of the Sonnets.

1889. Oscar Wilde: The Portrait of Mr. W. H., *Blackwood's Magazine*, 146: 1.
Fancifully develops a theory that W. H. was Willie Hughes, a boy actor; incidentally opposes both the Southampton and Pembroke theories, and favors Marlowe as the rival poet. Reprinted in London (n.d.) and in Portland, Maine (Mosher, 1901).

1890. W. Underhill: Mr. W. H.; Sh.'s Sonnets, *Notes & Queries*, 7th s., 9: 227, 302.
Proposes to read "To Mr. W. Hall happiness" in the Dedication; discusses the Hall family of Worcestershire. Comment, p. 303, by W. T. Lynn, C. A. Ward, and A. Hall.

1890. T. Tyler: The Dedication of Sh.'s Sonnets, *Academy*, June 14, p. 408.
On the Dedication and the Pembroke theory.

1890. C. C. Stopes: Sh.'s Sonnets, "W. H.," and the Dark Lady, *Poet Lore*, 2: 460.
A review of Tyler's edition; opposes the Pembroke and Chapman theories.

1890. Dr. Sachs: Sh.'s Gedichte, *Jahrbuch*, 25: 132.
Sonnets discussed, pp. 148–67; general review and bibliography.

1890. C. C. Stopes: [Review of Tyler's edition of the Sonnets,] *Jahrbuch*, 25: 185.
Identifies W. H. as William Hunnis; this theory withdrawn in a contribution to the *Jahrbuch*, 27: 200.

1890. G. Chiarini: Il Matrimonio e gli Amori di Guglielmo Sh., *Nuova Antologia*, 3d s., 26: 5, 438; 27: 112.
Also issued separately. In general favors the Pembroke-Fitton theory.

1891. B. Nicholson: Sonnet 77, 10, *Notes & Queries*, 7th s., 11: 24.

1891. F. J. Furnivall: Mary Fitton Again, *Academy*, March 21, p. 282.
Further discussion by Furnivall, pp. 325 and 370; replies by Tyler, pp. 304, 346, 395.

1891. W. J. Rolfe: The Mr. W. H. of the Sonnets, *Critic*, n.s., 16: 334.
On a portrait of Pembroke.

1891. [Report of a paper by Tyler, on "The Latest Objections to the Herbert-Fitton Theory of the Sonnets," before the New

Shakespeare Society, meeting of Dec. 11,] *Academy*, Dec. 19, p. 567.

1891. B. Nicholson: Sonnet 146, 2, *Notes & Queries*, 7th s., 11: 364.
Reply by C. C. B. in 12: 423.

1891. B. Nicholson: Was Mr. W. H. the Earl of Pembroke? *Athenæum*, July 11, p. 74.

1891. I. Goodlet: A New Word on Sh.'s Sonnets, *Poet Lore*, 3: 505.
Emphasizes the relationship of the Sonnets to *Two Gentlemen of Verona*.

1891. S. Arnaud: Les Sonnets de Sh., *Nouvelle Revue*, 71: 537.
Discusses Southampton theory; several sonnets translated.

1892. C. G. O. Bridgeman: The Fitton Portraits at Arbury, *Academy*, Jan. 9, p. 40.
A reply by Tyler, issue of Jan. 16, p. 66.

1892. B. Nicholson: Sonnet 100, 9, *Notes & Queries*, 8th s., 2: 5.
On the meaning of *resty*. Further discussion by Tyler and E. S. A. on p. 283, and by C. C. B. in 4: 444.

1892. R. Shindler: The Stolen Key, *Gentleman's Magazine*, 272: 70.
Argues the want of authenticity and continuity of the quarto of 1609.

1893. E. B. Brownlow: Sonnet 126, *Notes & Queries*, 8th s., 3: 103.
On the text of line 2; discussed by C. C. B. on p. 285.

1893. A. von Mauntz: Sh.'s Lyrische Gedichte, *Jahrbuch*, 28: 274.
In part follows up Massey's theory.

1893. Horace Davis: The Comparison of Hair to Wires in Sonnet 130, *Critic*, n.s., 19: 419.

1894. W. J. Rolfe: Sh.'s Sonnets set to Music, *Critic*, n.s., 21: 238.

1894. L. W. Spring: The Friendship of Sh. with Mr. W. H. and the Dark Lady, *Education*, 14: 599.

1895. G. Sarrazin: Die Entstehung von Sh.'s Verlorener Liebesmühe, *Jahrbuch*, 31: 200.
Discusses the date of the Sonnets; opposes the Pembroke theory.

1895. H. Conrad: Sh. und die Essex-Familie, *Preussische Jahrbücher*, 79: 183.
The possible identification of the friend of the Sonnets with Essex discussed, pp. 184–90.

1895. W. J. Rolfe: Something New on Sh.'s Sonnets, *Critic*, n.s., 24: 152.
A theory proposed in George Paston's novel, *A Study in Prejudices*.

*1896. J. Caro: Ueber Sh.'s Sonette, Berichte des freien deutschen Hochstiftes zu Frankfort a. M., n.s., 12: 1. [*Jahrb.*, 33: 370.]

1896. R. M. Spence: The Sonnets; the two Obeli in the Globe edition, *Notes & Queries*, 8th s., 10: 450.

On 60, 13 and 146, 2. Discussed by C. C. B. and Sherborne, 11: 223, 343.

1896. G. Sarrazin: Zur Chronologie von Sh.'s Dichtungen, *Jahrbuch*, 32: 149.

Discusses parallelisms of style as indications of date.

1897. G. A. Leigh: The Rival Poet in Sh.'s Sonnets, *Westminster Review*, 147: 173.

Tasso proposed as the rival poet.

1897. F. J. Furnivall: Sh. and Mary Fitton, *The Theatre*, Dec. 1.

1897. William Archer: Sh.'s Sonnets: the case against Southampton, *Fortnightly Review*, n.s., 62: 817.

Sums up the evidence for the Pembroke theory.

1897. T. Tyler: "Mr. W. H." and the "D. N. B.," *Academy*, July 24, p. 78.

On Lee's abandonment of the Pembroke theory. Further discussion by E. K. Chambers, in the issues of July 31 (p. 98) and Aug. 14 (p. 138), and by Tyler and A. Hall in that of Aug. 7 (pp. 117–18).

1897. A. Hall: Sh.'s Sonnets, *Academy*, Sept. 11, p. 207.

On Lady Penelope Devereux as the Dark Lady.

1897. Anon.: The Dark Lady Unveiled, *Academy*, Oct. 30, p. 341.

On the Fitton theory and Lady Newdigate-Newdegate's *Gossip from a Muniment Room.*

1897. J. Vaughan: An "Ancient Market Towne," *Temple Bar*, 110: 109.

Sketches the Southampton-Vernon romance in accordance with Massey's theory of the Sonnets.

1897. A. von Mauntz: Einige Glossen zu Sh.'s Sonett 121, *Anglia*, 19: 291.

1898. Sidney Lee: Sh. and the Earl of Pembroke, *Fortnightly Review*, n.s., 63: 210.

A reply to Archer; the substance included in the writer's *Life of Sh.*

1898. J. Churton Collins: Sh.'s Sonnets, *Saturday Review*, 85: 285.

Opposes both the Southampton and Pembroke theories. Reprinted in the writer's *Ephemera Critica.*

1898. C. C. Stopes: The Date of Sh.'s Sonnets, *Athenæum*, Mar. 19 and 26, pp. 374, 405.

Develops the Southampton theory; proposes William Harvey as W. H.

1898. G. Sarrazin: Wortechos bei Sh. (II), *Jahrbuch*, 34: 119.

List for the Sonnets on pp. 162–63.

1898. G. Sarrazin: Zu Sonett 104, *Jahrbuch*, 34: 368.

On the date of this sonnet, and, in consequence, of the series.

1898. J. M. S.: The Life of Sh., *Spectator*, Dec. 3, p. 830.

On a parallel in the correspondence of St. Evremond (see p. 109).

1898. Samuel Butler: Sh.'s Sonnets and the Ireland Forgeries, *Athenæum*, Dec. 24, p. 907.

On the meaning of "begetter" (see p. 10).

1898. Anon.: A German Mare's Nest, *Academy*, Jan. 15, p. 79.

A critique of Sarrazin's *Sh.'s Lehrjahre*.

1898. T. Tyler: Dr. Brandes and Sh.'s Sonnets, *Academy*, Jan. 22, p. 105.

On the Pembroke theory.

1898. Sidney Lee: Sh. and the Earl of Southampton, *Cornhill Magazine*, 77: 482.

Substantially included in the writer's *Life of Sh.*

1898. Samuel Butler: Sh.'s Sonnets, *Athenæum*, July 30, p. 161.

Outlines the argument for an early date.

1898. Sylvanus Urban: [Notes on Wyndham's edition of the Poems, the Pembroke theory, etc., in "Table Talk,"] *Gentleman's Magazine*, 285: 102.

1898. Sylvanus Urban: A Sh. Mystery Solved, [etc., in "Table Talk,"] *Gentleman's Magazine*, 285: 617.

On Lee's view of the Dedication.

1898–99. Cuming Walters: The Mystery of Sh.'s Sonnets, *New Century Review*, 4: 440; 5: 89, 207.

Reappeared in book form, with the same title (see under IV, 1899).

1899. Cuming Walters: Sh.'s Sonnets as Clues to the Dramas, *New Century Review*, 6: 261.

Supplemental to the writer's book (see under IV, 1899); emphasizes the relation of the Sonnets to *L. L. L.*, *T. G. V.*, and *M. N. D.*

1899. A. Ainger: The Only Begetter of Sh.'s Sonnets, *Athenæum*, Jan. 14 and 28, pp. 59, 121.

Supports Lee's interpretation of the Dedication.

1899. H. C. Beeching: The Sonnets of Michael Drayton, *Literature*, 5: 181.

Discusses the relation of Drayton's sonnets and Sh.'s. Reprinted as an appendix to the writer's edition of the Sonnets (see I, 1904).

1899. Cuming Walters: [Letters to the editor,] *Literature*, 4: 585, 642.

In reply to a review of the writer's book (see IV, 1899), with special reference to the Pembroke theory.

1899. J. W. Bright: Two Notelets on Sh., *Modern Language Notes*, 14: 186.

Includes an interpretation of Sonnet 1, 14.

1899. W. J. Rolfe: [A reply to Sidney Lee's account of the Sonnets,] *Critic*, 35: 737.

1899. W. L. Rushton: Sonnet 146, *Notes & Queries*, 9th s., 4: 142.

An emendation.

1900. F. A. White: Mr. W. H. of Sh.'s Sonnets, *New Century Review*, 7: 228.

Identifies "W. H." of the Dedication as William Hathaway, and the youth of the sonnets as his son.

1900. A. Hall: Sh.'s Sonnets, Print 1609, *Notes & Queries*, 9th s., 6: 248.

Regards S. 126 as written in 1609 to authenticate the sonnet series. A reply by C. E. H., p. 435.

*1900. F. Henry: [Note on Lee's theory of the Dedication,] *Literature*, 6: 320.

In opposition to the identification of W. H. with William Hall the stationer. Reported in *Jahrbuch*, 37: 287.

1900. Y. Y.: Sh.'s Sonnets in French, *Bookman* (N.Y.), 12: 132.

Review of Henry's translation (see under IIIb, 1900), with argument against the autobiographical theories. The same matter in *The Bookman* of London, 18: 13, with the title, "Are Sh.'s Sonnets Autobiographical?"

1900. Sidney Lee: Beget and Begetter in Elizabethan English, *Athenæum*, Feb. 24, p. 250.

Replies by Dowden and Butler in the numbers for March 10 and 24, pp. 315, 379; further discussion by Ainger, March 17, p. 346, and by Lee, March 17, p. 345. (See pp. 11–12 above.)

1900. C. F. McClumpha: Parallels between Sh.'s Sonnets and Love's Labour 's Lost, *Modern Language Notes*, 15: 188.

1900. C. C. Stopes: "Mr. W. H.," *Athenæum*, Aug. 4, p. 154.

Further consideration of William Harvey.

1900. R. Garnett: The Date of the Sonnets, *Literature*, 6: 211.

On the date of Sonnet 66; reported in *Jahrbuch*, 37: 285. Reply by T. L. M. Douse, p. 229.

1901. C. F. McClumpha: Parallels between Sh.'s Sonnets and A Midsummer Night's Dream, *Modern Language Notes*, 16: 164.

1901. A. Filon: Les Sonnets de Sh., *Revue des deux Mondes*, ser. 5, 2: 795.

Develops the biographic interpretation.

1901. [C. Creighton:] Sh. and the Earl of Pembroke, *Blackwood's Magazine*, 169: 668, 829.

Maintains that Sh. himself published the Sonnets; interprets the italic type of the Quarto as significant; views Daniel as the rival poet. Substantially included in the writer's *Sh.'s Story of his Life*, 1904.

1902. H. C. Beeching: The Sonnets of Sh., *Cornhill Magazine*, n.s., 12: 244.

Substantially embodied in the author's edition of the Sonnets (see I, 1904).

*1902. E. Reichel: Das Porträt des herrn W. H., *Die Gegenwart*, 62: 250.

[*Jahrbuch*, 39: 397.]

1902. W. E. Ormsby: Sh.'s 76th Sonnet, *Notes & Queries*, 9th s., 10: 125.

On the phrase "noted weed" and the Baconians. A considerable discussion followed, in vols. 11 and 12.

1902. W. A. Henderson: Sh. in the Sonnets, *Notes & Queries*, 9th s., 10: 343.

Views Edmund Sh. as the person chiefly addressed in the Sonnets.

1902. M. H. L[iddell]: Sh.'s Sonnets in MS., *Nation*, New York, 75: 10.

Describes a MS. in a Dobell catalogue; see p. 23 above.

1903. J. D. Butler: World without End, *Notes & Queries*, 9th s., 11: 448.

On the phrase in Sonnet 57.

1903. G. Stronach: Sh.'s Sonnets: a new Theory, *Notes & Queries*, 9th s., 12: 141, 273.

Views the collection as a miscellany by various writers, including Barnes. Replies by H. Ingleby and "Ne Quid Nimis," pp. 210–11.

1904. R. F. Towndrow: Canker-Blooms and Canker, *Athenæum*, July 23, p. 123; Aug. 6, p. 188.

On "canker-blooms" in Sonnet 54; opposed by G. Birdwood in the numbers for July 30 and Aug. 13, pp. 156, 219.

1904. E. D. S[tone]: Sh.'s Sonnet 146, *Notes & Queries*, 10th s., 1: 204.

A Latin translation.

1904. T. L. M. Douse: Sh.'s Sonnet 26, *Notes & Queries*, 10th s., 2: 133.

1904. C. F. McClumpha: Sh.'s Sonnets and Romeo & Juliet, *Jahrbuch*, 40: 187.

1904. P. Tausig: Zu Sh.'s Sonetten 153 und 154, *Jahrbuch*, 40: 231.

1904. P. E. More: Sh.'s Sonnets, *Evening Post*, New York, August 6.

Discusses Sh.'s personality in the Sonnets. Reprinted in the writer's *Shelburne Essays*, 2d Series, 1906.

1905. D. Klein: Foreign Influence on Sh.'s Sonnets, *Sewanee Review*, 13: 454.

On the platonic influences, those of the *Pléiade*, etc.

*1907. L. L. Schücking: Die Widmung der Sonette Sh.'s, *Frankfurter Zeitung*, March 26.

Interprets the Dedication as meaning that Thorpe wishes William Hall the eternity which Sh. promises (=may be expected) to attain. Reported in *Jahrbuch*, 44: 292.

*1907. R. von Kralik: Sh. Studien, *Die Kultur*, 8: 385.

Discusses the Dedication (believing W. H. a misprint for W. S.) and the autobiographical element in the Sonnets. Reported in *Jahrbuch*, 44: 292, 295–96.

1908. M. J. Wolff: Sh. im Buchhandel seiner Zeit, *Jahrbuch*, 44: 126.

Discusses Thorpe and the Quarto of 1609, p. 135.

1908. H. Pemberton, Jr.: The Sonnets, *New Shakespeareana*, 7: 105.

On Sonnet 107.

1909. H. Pemberton, Jr.: Topical Allusions in the Sonnets, and the Identity of the Person to whom the Sonnets were addressed, *New Shakespeareana*, 8: 61.

On Sonnets 125, 153, 154; supports the Pembroke theory.

1909. H. W. Mabie: Sonnets of Sh., *Outlook*, 92: 1025.

Introduction to a reprint of five sonnets.

1909. D. J.: Sh.'s Sonnets, their Dedication, *Notes & Queries*, 10th s., 12: 265.

On another dedication of Thorpe's.

1909. Sidney Lee: Ovid and Sh.'s Sonnets, *Quarterly Review*, 210: 455.

*1910. B. Badt: Erlebnis und Dichtung in Sh.'s Sonetten, *Der Zeitgeist*, Jan. 10.

Platonism in the Sonnets. Reported in *Jahrbuch*, 47: 270.

1910. E. S. Bates: The Sincerity of Sh.'s Sonnets, *Modern Philology*, 8: 87.

1910. S. B. Hemingway: Sonnet 8 and Mr. William Hughes, Musician, *Modern Language Notes*, 25: 210.

*1910. K. Bleibtreu: [Note in] *Die Gegenwart*, 75: 395.

On Sonnet 111; reported in *Jahrbuch*, 46: 215.

1910. E. A. Kock: Three Shaksperian Passages Explained, *Anglia*, 31: 133.

Includes a note on Sonnet 30, 4.

1910. B. Holland: The "Dark Lady" to Mr. W. Sh., *National Review*, 56: 260.

Eleven sonnets, imagined as sent in reply to Sh.'s.

1910. K. Groos & I. Netto: Psychologisch-statistische Untersuchungen über die visuellen Sinneseindrücke in Sh.'s lyrischen und epischen Dichtungen, *Englische Studien*, 43: 27.

Statistics on the color-images in the Sonnets, pp. 32–38.

*1910. F. Gundolf: Sh.'s Sonette, *Die Zukunft*, No. 41, p. 65. [*Jahrb.*, 47: 390.]

1911. G. Bernard Shaw: The Dark Lady of the Sonnets, *Red Book Magazine*, 16: 421.

A one-act play, based on the Fitton theory.

1911. Louise I. Guiney: Sh. and "Warray," *Notes & Queries*, 11th s., 4: 84.

On Sonnet 146, 2. A reply by C. C. B., p. 243.

1911. M. J. Wolff: Zu den Sonetten, *Jahrbuch*, 47: 191.

On an Italian version of the source of Sonnets 153–54.

1911. A. Platt: Edward III and Sh.'s Sonnets, *Modern Language Review*, 6: 511.

On the alleged priority of Sonnets 94 and 142 to the play.

1912. C. C. B.: Sh.'s Sonnets: the Rival Poet, *Notes & Queries*, 11th s., 5: 190.

Favors Marlowe.

1912. W. B. Brown: The Text of Sh.'s Sonnets 125–126, *Notes & Queries*, 11th s., 6: 446.

Replies by C. C. B., 7: 32, 153; by "Tom Jones," 7: 32; further discussion by W. B. Brown, 7: 76, 236.

1912. J. E. G. de Montmorency: The Mystery of Sh.'s Sonnets, *Contemporary Review*, 101: 737.

Esoteric.

1912. J. E. G. de Montmorency: The "Other Poet" of Sh.'s Sonnets, *Contemporary Review*, 101: 885.

Argument for Spenser.

1913. W. B. Brown: The Mr. W. H. of Sh.'s Sonnets, *Notes & Queries*, 11th s., 7: 241, 262.

On the *Hews* of Sonnet 20.

1913. W. M. Blatt: A New Light on the Sonnets, *Modern Philology*, 11: 135.

Views the Sonnets as written by Sh. as a hired spokesman.

1913. C. C. Stopes: An Early Variant of a Sh. Sonnet, *Athenæum*, July 26, p. 89.

A MS. variant of Sonnet 2. Other variants of the same sonnet described by B. Dobell, Aug. 2, p. 112, and by H. T. Price, Sept. 6, p. 230 (see pp. 21–22 above).

1913. W. B. Brown: Buds of Marjoram, *Notes & Queries*, 11th s., 8: 169.

On Sonnet 99, 7. Further discussion by A. R. Bayley, p. 213, and by C. C. B., p. 237.

*1913. S. von Hegedüs: [Article in] *Ungarischen Rundschau für historische und soziale Wissenschaften*, 2: 586.

On a Latin medium for the Greek source of Sonnets 153, 154; reported in *Jahrbuch*, 50: 153.

1913. Clara L. de Chambrun: The Inspirers of Sh.'s Sonnets, *North American Review*, 198: 131.

On the Mistress Davenant theory.

1913. A. von Berzeviczy: Die Sonette Michelangelos und Sh.'s, *Pester Lloyd*, Dec. 9.

A comparison of the two collections; reported in *Jahrbuch*, 51: 251.

1914. J. Q. Adams, Jr.: Two Notes on Hamlet, *Modern Language Notes*, 29: 1.

Includes a note on "eisel" in S. 111.

1914. G. Sarrazin: Sh.'s Sonette, *Internationale Monatsschrift*, 8: 1071.

General; develops the Southampton theory, and discusses the date of the Sonnets.

1914. S. A. Tannenbaum: The Heart of Sh.'s Mystery, *The Dial*, Chicago, 56: 494.

Review of books by Acheson and the Countess of Chambrun (see IV, 1913).

1914. G. C. Moore Smith: Sonnets, 51, Lines 10f., *Modern Language Review*, 9: 372.

1914. Judge Evans: Venus & Adonis and the earlier Sonnets of Sh., *Saturday Review*, Dec. 26, p. 647.

On Sonnets 1–17.

1915. R. M. Alden: [Review of books by Acheson and the Countess of Chambrun,] *Journal of English and Germanic Philology*, 14: 449.

Discussion of the alleged relation of the Sonnets to *Willobie his Avisa* (see pp. 480–81).

1915. H. D. Gray: The Arrangement and the Date of Sh.'s Sonnets. *Publications of the Modern Language Association*, n.s., 23: 629.

1915. E. H. Wilkins: The Enueg in Petrarch and in Sh., *Modern Philology*, 13: 111.

On S. 66 as an example of the *enueg* form.

1916. M. J. Wolff: Petrarkismus und Antipetrarkismus in Sh.'s Sonetten, *Englische Studien*, 49: 161.

On the conventional elements in the Renaissance sonnet (see p. 459 above).

1916. R. M. Alden: The 1640 Text of Sh.'s Sonnets, *Modern Philology*, 14: 17.

A proof that the text of 1640 was made from that of 1609 (see p. 422 above).

1916. R. M. Alden: The 1710 and 1714 Texts of Sh.'s Poems, *Modern Language Notes*, 31: 268.

An account of the texts which may be attributed to Gildon (see under II, 1710).

VI. BOOKS CONTAINING INCIDENTAL MATTER ON THE SONNETS

1797. [G. Chalmers:] An Apology for the Believers in the Sh. Papers which were exhibited in Norfolk Street.

Pp. 41–66; proposes the view that the Sonnets were addressed to Queen Elizabeth.

1799. G. Chalmers: A Supplemental Apology for the Believers in the Sh. Papers [etc.].

Pp. 38–104.

1809–11. A. W. von Schlegel: Ueber dramatische Kunst und Literatur. Heidelberg.

Passage on the value of the Sonnets as biographical documents (Black trans., ed. 1840, 2: 116).

1815. W. Wordsworth: Essay, supplementary to the Preface to the Lyrical Ballads.

Passage on the literary value of the Sonnets (Poems, Globe ed., p. 868).

1817. Nathan Drake: Sh. and his Times.

The earliest argument for the Southampton theory (2: 50–86).

1817. S. T. Coleridge: Biographia Literaria.

Remarks on the Sonnets in chapters 2 and 15.

1829. Mrs. [Anna B. M.] Jameson: Memoirs of the Loves of the Poets.

Chapter 15 "On the Love of Sh."; Southampton theory accepted.

1835. S. T. Coleridge: Table Talk.

Entry for May 14, 1833; remarks on male friendship.

[1835.] R. F. Housman: A Collection of English Sonnets.

26 of Sh.'s Sonnets included, with notes.

1837–39. H. Hallam: Introduction to the Literature of Europe in the 15th, 16th, and 17th Centuries.

Sonnets discussed, vol. 3, chap. 5, §§ 48–50.

1839. H. Ulrici: Ueber Sh.'s dramatische Kunst. Halle.

Translated by Dora Schmitz, 1846. Views of Delius, Neil, and Massey opposed in detail (Bk. 2, chaps. 3, 6; Bohn ed., 1876, 1: 206–17, 240–43).

1845. J. Hunter: New Illustrations of the Life, Studies, and Writings of Sh.

Discusses the relation of the sonnets on marriage to Much Ado about Nothing (1: 236–41).

[1848?] E. J. Delécluze: Dante Alighieri ou la Poésie Amoureuse. Paris.

On the resemblance between the *Vita Nuova* and Sh.'s Sonnets (pp. 516–37).

1849–50. G. G. Gervinus: Shakespeare. Leipzig.

Translated by F. E. Bunnett, as *Sh. Commentaries*, 1863. Southampton theory followed, and Sh.'s personality discussed with reference to the Sonnets (ed. 1883, pp. 441–74).

[1851.] H. K. S. Causton: Essay on Mr. Singer's "Wormwood" . . . and a reading of Sh.'s Sonnet 111.

Pamphlet; on the meaning of the word "eisel."

1857. Henry Reed: Lectures on the British Poets. Philadelphia.

An appended essay on English Sonnets (2: 235) contains comments on several of Sh.'s.

1857. [C. Bathurst:] Remarks on the Differences in Sh.'s Versification in different Periods of his Life.

Pp. 110–15, on the date of the Sonnets.

1858. F. A. T. Kreyssig: Vorlesungen über Shakespeare. Berlin.

Reviews the general literature of the subject (2d ed., 1874, 1: 114–23).

1859. John, Lord Campbell: Sh.'s Legal Acquirements.

Remarks on the legal metaphors in several of the Sonnets.

1860. W. S. Walker: Critical Examination of the Text of Sh. Edited by W. N. Lettsom.

Grammatical and textual comments, *passim*.

1861. S. Neil: Shakespeare, a Critical Biography.

Pp. 104–08; W. H. identified as William Hathaway.

1863–64. H. A. Taine: Histoire de la Littérature Anglaise. Paris.

Bk. 2, chap. 4, § 1, on Sh.'s personality with reference to the love-story of the Sonnets.

1864. T. Kenny: The Life and Genius of Shakespeare.

The male friendship discussed (pp. 79–82).

*1864. A. Bekk: William Sh., eine biographische Studie. München.

Mentioned by Kreyssig (see V, 1863), as regarding many of the Sonnets as addressed to Sh.'s wife.

1866. [R. H. Shepherd:] Tennysoniana.

2d ed., 1879. Chap. 4 on "In Memoriam and Sh.'s Sonnets"; some twenty parallels adduced.

1866. E. W. Sievers: William Sh., sein Leben und Dichten. Gotha.

Pp. 90–110. Discusses the relation of the friendship for Southampton to Sh.'s poetical development.

1867. Leigh Hunt and S. A. Lee: The Book of the Sonnet.

For Sh.'s Sonnets, see Hunt's introductory Essay on the Sonnet, 1: 75–77, and notes on the eight selected sonnets, pp. 154–64.

[1867.] G. Ross, M.D.: Studies, Biographical and Literary.

The Sonnets discussed in the Essay on Sh.'s Mad Characters (pp. 51–54), with reference to the alleged resemblance of Hamlet and Sh.

1869. Carl Karpf: To ti ēn einai: die Idee Sh.'s und deren Verwirklichung. Hamburg.

Esoteric; the Sonnets in their relation to the Aristotelian philosophy (pp. 29–124).

1869. E. A. Abbott: A Shakespearian Grammar.

2d ed., 1870. Grammatical notes, *passim*.

1872. R. Genée: Sh., sein Leben und seine Werke. Hildburghausen.

Pp. 83–87. Opposes Delius.

1874. W. Minto: Characteristics of English Poets from Chaucer to Shirley.

2d ed., 1885. Chap. 5, § 7; Chapman proposed as the "rival poet."

1874. C. M. Ingleby: Sh.'s Centurie of Prayse; being materials for a history of opinion on Sh. and his works.

Reprinted by the New Sh. Society, 1879. Includes a passage from *Willobie his Avisa*, with the suggestion that it has to do with the story of Sh., the friend, and the dark lady.

1874. W. C. Hazlitt: Prefaces, Dedications, Epistles.

On page 226 two dedications of Thorpe's are discussed, as evidence against the identification of Pembroke as the W. H. of the Sonnets Dedication.

1874. H. von Friesen: Sh.-Studien. I, Altengland und W. Sh. Wien.

Pp. 324–48. Develops the autobiographical theory.

1874–75. Alexander Schmidt: Shakespeare Lexicon. Berlin.

1875. E. Dowden: Shakspere, a Critical Study of his Mind and Art.

Sonnets discussed in chap. 8. Other issues in 1876, 1880, etc.

1876. Karl Elze: William Sh. Halle.

Translated by Dora Schmitz, 1888. Discusses friendship as a Renaissance theme; opposes the autobiographical theory (pp. 369–80, 493–505; translation, pp. 320–29, 428–38).

*1877. G. S. Caldwell: Sir Walter Raleigh the Author of Sh.'s Plays and Sonnets. Melbourne.

Described by Dowden, edition of the Sonnets, 1881, p. 102.

1878. W. M. Rossetti: Lives of Famous Poets.

Pp. 50–56. Discusses the male friendship.

1878. J. Bulloch: Studies on the Text of Sh., with numerous Emendations.

Pp. 280–95, textual notes; and Appendix, pp. 306–10, on the Sonnets and Dedication.

1879. Justin Winsor: Sh.'s Poems; a Bibliography of the Earlier Editions. Bibliographical Contributions of the Harvard University Library, No. 2. Cambridge, Mass.

1880. D. M. Main: A Treasury of English Sonnets.

Contains 57 of Sh.'s, with notes.

1882. J. O. Halliwell-Phillipps: Outlines of the Life of Sh.

Issued in smaller form, privately printed, in 1881; issued in successive revised editions in 1883, etc. For the Sonnets, see in the final editions (7th–10th), 1: 173–76, 226; 2: 303–05.

*1882. F. Krauss: Sh.'s Selbstbekenntnisse. Weimar.

Includes an elaboration of the author's commentary on the Sonnets; see under IIIa, 1872. Reviewed in *Jahrbuch*, 18: 248.

1883. B. G. Kinnear: Cruces Shakespearianae; difficult passages in the Works of Sh. [etc.].

Various emendations (pp. 496–504).

1883. Mark Pattison: The Sonnets of John Milton [edited].

The Introduction discusses the Shakespearean sonnet form.

1884. A List of all the Songs and Passages in Sh. which have been set to Music. Compiled by J. Greenhill, Rev. W. A. Harrison, and F. J. Furnivall. New Shakspere Society Publications.

For the Sonnets, see pp. 75–88.

1886. F. G. Fleay: A Chronicle History of the Life and Work of W. Sh.

Pp. 120–24; 161. Discusses the alleged relationship of the Sonnets to a passage in *Willobie his Avisa*.

1891. F. G. Fleay: A Biographical Chronicle of the English Stage.

"Excursus on Sh.'s Sonnets," 2: 208–32; emphasizes their relationship to Drayton's verse, and discusses their date.

1894. Barrett Wendell: William Shakspere. New York.

Pp. 221–37.

1895. Henry Morley and W. Hall Griffin: English Writers, vol. 11.

Pp. 326–34 and (bibliography) 441–42; views the Sonnets as largely imaginative, and analyzes them into topical series.

1895. F. E. Schelling: A Book of Elizabethan Lyrics. Boston.

The Introduction discusses the Elizabethan sonnet, pp. xvi–xxi; for notes on eight selected sonnets, see pp. 246–49.

1896. F. S. Boas: Sh. and his Predecessors.

Pages 114–21. Defends the autobiographic theory and the Pembroke and Chapman identifications.

1896. J. P. Yeatman: The Gentle Sh., a Vindication.

Pp. 295–301; argues that many of the sonnets are the work of other writers than Sh.

1896. C. E[llis]: Sh. and the Bible: Fifty Sonnets with their Scriptural Harmonies.

Eccentric. Embodied in the writer's volume, *Christ in Sh.*, 1897.

1897. G. Sarrazin: W. Sh.'s Lehrjahre. Weimar.

Litterarhistorische Forschungen, No. 5. Chap. 7 (pp. 149–74) on "Die Jugend-Sonette"; argument for the Southampton theory, and on the question of date; relation of the Sonnets to Daniel's verse emphasized.

1897. J. M. Robertson: Montaigne and Sh.

Some parallels noted for the Sonnets.

1897. Lady Newdigate-Newdegate: Gossip from a Muniment Room; being passages in the lives of Anne and Mary Fitton.

Contains matter of some interest in connection with the Pembroke-Fitton theory. In the second edition, 1898, is an Appendix by C. G. O. Bridgeman, on the Portraits of Mary Fitton. The book is fully discussed, in relation to the Sonnets, by A. von Mauntz, *Jahrbuch*, 34: 378.

1898. Sidney Lee: A Life of William Sh.

Revised editions, 1909 and 1916. Chapters 7–8, and Appendices 3–10. Opposes the Pembroke theory; emphasizes the patronage of Southampton; discusses the relation of the Sonnets to continental sonneteering in the Renaissance.

1898. G. Brandes: William Sh., a Critical Study.

Bk. 2, chaps. 5–7. Develops the Pembroke theory, and discusses Platonism in the Sonnets.

1900. W. Franz: Shakespeare-Grammatik. Halle.

1900. H. W. Mabie: William Sh., Poet, Dramatist, and Man. New York.

Chap. 9. This chapter also appeared in *The Outlook*, Aug. 25, 1900.

1902. Studies in Honor of Basil L. Gildersleeve. Baltimore.

Contains paper by T. R. Price, on The Technic of Sh.'s Sonnets (p. 363); the fiction theory defended.

1903. Bowyer Nichols: A Little Book of English Sonnets.

Introduction (pp. xvii–xxiii) discusses the form of the Shakespearean sonnet.

1903. W. C. Hazlitt: Sh., Himself and his Work.

4th ed., enlarged, 1912. Pp. 208–67; views the Sonnets as a miscellany, in wholly uncertain order.

1903. A. von Mauntz: Heraldik in Diensten der Sh.-Forschung. Berlin.

The sixth and seventh sections ("studies") discuss an alleged quarrel between Sh. and Gabriel Harvey, proposing the latter as the rival poet, and a certain Lady Smith as both patroness and "dark lady."

1903. John Erskine: The Elizabethan Lyric. New York.

Pp. 167–75.

[1904.] W. J. Rolfe: Life of William Sh. Boston.

Pp. 328–65. Opposes the authority of the 1609 arrangement; supports the Pembroke theory.

[1904.] Sidney Lee: Elizabethan Sonnets, newly arranged and indexed. [New English Garner.]

Introduction on Elizabethan sonnet literature.

1904. H. R. D. Anders: Sh.'s Books. Berlin.

A few notes on Sonnet sources, *passim*.

1905. R. Genée: William Sh. in seinem Werden und Wesen. Berlin.
Pp. 181–82; 292–97. The Southampton theory followed.

1906. Morton Luce: A Handbook to the Works of W. Sh.
Pp. 82–97.

*1906. G. Sarrazin: Aus Sh.'s Meisterwerkstatt. Berlin.
Develops the writer's opinions on the date of the Sonnets; see under V, 1895, 1896, 1898.

1907. Walter Raleigh: Shakespeare [English Men of Letters].
Pp. 85–93. Emphasizes the autobiographic interpretation.

1908. G. Saintsbury: History of English Prosody, vol. 2.
The metrical form of the Sonnets discussed (pp. 59–61).

1908. H. Reimer: Der Vers in Sh.'s nichtdramatischen Werken. Bonn.
Dissertation; general and perfunctory.

1909. Frank Harris: The Man Sh. and his Tragic Life-Story.
Bk. 2, chaps. 3–5. Discusses the love-story of the sonnets; develops the Fitton theory.

1909. A. C. Bradley: Oxford Lectures on Poetry.
Pp. 327–36. Discusses the autobiographical significance of the Sonnets.

1909. J. J. Jusserand: A Literary History of the English People.
Vol. 2, pp. 226–43; discusses the biographic significance and the literary qualities of the Sonnets.

1910. Sidney Lee: The French Renaissance in England.
Bk. 4, chaps. 12–14: "The Assimilation of the French Sonnet"; "Sh. and the French Sonnet"; "The Poetic Vaunt of Immortality."

1910. Cambridge History of English Literature, vol. 5.
Pp. 228–33; American ed., 256–61. Sh.'s Poems discussed by G. Saintsbury.

1911. Percy Simpson: Shakespearian Punctuation. Oxford.
On the punctuation of the quarto of 1609, *passim*.

1911. William Jaggard: Shakespeare Bibliography. Stratford-on-Avon.
Poems, pp. 433–41; Sonnets, pp. 452–56.

1911. J. W. Mackail: Lectures on Poetry.
Pp. 179–207. Lecture on the Sonnets, defending the 1609 arrangement, and discussing date and literary value.

1912. E. B. Reed: English Lyrical Poetry. New Haven.
Pp. 169–76.

1912. Essays and Studies by Members of the English Association, vol. 3; collected by W. P. Ker.
Contains an essay by J. W. Mackail on "A Lover's Complaint," in which he proposes the view (pp. 66–69) that the poem is the work of the "rival poet" of the Sonnets.

1912. Frank Harris: The Women of Sh.
Discusses, *passim*, the Sonnets on the basis of the Fitton theory.

1912. Henry Brown: Sh.'s Patrons, and other Essays [posthumous].

Contains essays on Southampton and Pembroke, on the singing of Sh.'s Sonnets, on Sh.'s preference for blond beauty, and on the general question of the interpretation of the Sonnets (see the writer's work under IV, 1870).

1913. Anniversary Papers by Colleagues and Pupils of George Lyman Kittredge. Boston.

Contains paper by R. M. Alden, on the Quarto Arrangement of Sh.'s Sonnets (p. 279); see above, p. 430.

1915. C. C. Stopes: Sh.'s Environment.

Contains essay on "The Friends in Sh.'s Sonnets," pp. 135–60, from the Transactions of the Royal Society of Literature, 1908; various aspects of the Southampton theory, largely included in the writer's earlier publications.

*1915. H. Kliem: Sentimentale Freundschaft in der Sh. Epoche. Jena.

Dissertation. Justifies the man-friendship of the Sonnets. Reviewed in *Jahrbuch*, 51: 260.

INDEXES

INDEX TO BIBLIOGRAPHY

E. S. A. V, 1892.
Abbott, E. A. VI, 1869.
Acheson, A. IV, 1903, 1913.
Adams, J. Q. V, 1914.
Ainger, A. V, 1899, 1900.
Alden, R. M. I, 1913; V, 1915, 1916; VI, 1913.
Alger, W. R. V, 1862.
Anders, H. R. D. VI, 1904.
Anderson, R. II, 1795.
Archer, W. V, 1897.
Arnaud, S. V, 1891.
Asher, D. V, 1861.
Axon, W. E. A. V, 1884.

C. C. B. V, 1891, 1892, 1893, 1896, 1911, 1912, 1913.
J. G. B. V, 1885.
Badt, B. V, 1910.
Baltzer, A. IIIa, 1910.
Barnstorff, D. IV, 1860.
Barrett, H. W. V, 1847.
Barton, A. T. IIIj, 1913.
Bates, E. S. V, 1910.
Bathurst, C. VI, 1857.
Bauernfeld, E. V. IIIa, 1827.
Bayley, A. R. V, 1913.
Bayne, T. V, 1887.
Beeching, H. C. I, 1904; II, 1907; V, 1899, 1902.
Bekk, A. VI, 1864.
Bell, R. II, 1855; V, 1866.
Bennett, H. II, 1905.
Benson, J. II, 1640.
Berzeviczy, A. von. V, 1913.
Bibliothecary. V, 1879.
Birdwood, G. V, 1904.
Blair, J. T. . I, 1904.
Blatt, W. M. V, 1913.
Bleibtreu, K. V, 1910.
Blind, M. I, 1902.
Boaden, J. IV, 1837; V, 1832.
Boas, F. S. VI, 1896.
Bodenstedt, F. IIIa, 1862.
Boswell, J. II, 1821.
Bradley, A. C. VI, 1909.
Brae, A. E. V, 1873, 1877.
Brandes, G. I, 1904; VI, 1898.
Brandl, A. IIIa, 1913.
Bridgeman, C. G. O. V, 1892; VI, 1898.
Bright, B. H. V, 1832.
Bright, J. W. V, 1899.
Briscoe, J. P. I, 1900.
Brockington, W. A. I, 1895.
Brown, C. A. IV, 1838.
Brown, H. IV, 1870; VI, 1912.
Brown, W. B. V, 1912, 1913.
Browne, C. E. V, 1873, 1880.
Browne, J. H. V, 1884.
Brownlow, E. B. V, 1893.
Budd, T. D. I, 1868.
Bullen, A. H. I, 1905; II, 1907.
Bulloch, J. VI, 1878.
Burgersdijk, L. A. J. IIIf, 1879; V, 1879.
Butler, J. D. V, 1903.
Butler, S. I, 1899; V, 1898, 1900.

B. C. V, 1879.
Caldwell, G. S. VI, 1877.
Campbell, Lord. VI, 1859.
Campe. II, 1837.
Capell, E. II, 1710.
Caro, J. V, 1896.
Cartwright, R. I, 1859; V, 1862.
Causton, H. K. S. VI, 1851.
Chalmers, G. VI, 1797, 1799.
Chambers, E. K. II, 1906; V, 1897.
Chambrun, C. L. de. IV, 1913; V, 1913.
Chasles, P. V, 1862, 1867.
Chiarini, G. V, 1890.
Child, F. J. II, 1856.
Clark, W. G. II, 1864, 1866.
Clarke, C. & M. C. II, 1864.
Clelia. IV, 1892.
Coleridge, S. T. VI, 1817, 1835.
Collier, J. P. II, 1844.
Collins, J. C. V, 1898.
Conrad, H. V, 1895.
Conwell, C. I, 1901.
Cooke, C. II, 1797.
Copin, A. IIIb, 1888.

Corney, B. IV, 1862; V, 1862, 1865.
Craig, W. J. I, 1905; II, 1891.
Creighton, C. V, 1901.
Crosby, J. V, 1883.
Cunningham, P. VI, 1841.

Danckelmann, E. von. IV, 1897.
Darchini, L. IIIc, 1909.
Davidson, J. II, 1908.
Davis, H. V, 1888, 1893.
Dean, C. I, 1899.
Delécluze, E. J. VI, 1848.
Delius, N. II, 1856; V, 1865.
Dennis, J. I, 1902.
Direy, L. IIIb, 1891; IV, 1890.
Dobell, B. V, 1913.
Douse, T. L. M. V, 1900, 1904.
Dowden, E. I, 1881; II, 1903; V, 1886, 1900; VI, 1875.
Downing, C. IV, 1892.
Drake, N. VI, 1817.
Dunning, E. J. IV, 1897.
Dyce, A. II, 1832, 1856, 1857.

Edmonds, C. V, 1873.
Eichhoff, T. IV, 1903.
Ellis, C. VI, 1896.
Ellis, E. J. & T. J. I, 1883.
Ellis, F. S. II, 1893, 1899.
Elze, K. V, 1875; VI, 1876.
Erskine, J. VI, 1903.
Evans, Judge. V, 1914.
Evans, T. II, 1775.
Ewing, T. II, 1771.

Filon, A. V, 1901.
Fleay, F. G. V, 1875; VI, 1886, 1891.
Fleischer. II, 1826.
Franklyn, C. W. V, 1889.
Franz, W. VI, 1900.
Friesen, H. von. IIIa, 1869; V, 1869; VI, 1874.
Fulda, L. IIIa, 1913.
Furnivall, F. J. II, 1877; V, 1875, 1876, 1880, 1891, 1897; VI, 1884.

Gardiner, R. F. V, 1887.
Garnett, R. V, 1900.
Garnier, C. M. IIIb, 1906.
Garrett, R. M. IV, 1912.
Garrigues, G. V, 1887.
Gelbcke, F. A. IIIa, 1867.
Genée, R. VI, 1872, 1905.
Gentleman, F. II, 1774.
George, S. IIIa, 1909.
Gerbel, N. IIIh, 1880.
Gervinus, G. G. VI, 1849.
Gilbert, J. I, 1878.
Gildemeister, O. IIIa, 1871.
Gildon, C. II, 1710.
Gilfillan, G. II, 1856.
Gödeke, K. V, 1877.
Godwin, P. IV, 1900.
Gollancz, I. I, 1896.
Goodlet, I. V, 1891.
Gray, H. D. V, 1915.
Greenhill, J. VI, 1884.
Griffin, W. H. VI, 1895.
Groos, K. V, 1910.
Guiney, L. I. V, 1911.
Gundolf, F. V, 1910.
Guizot, F. IIIb, 1862.
Guttman. IIIa, 1875.

C. E. H. V, 1900.
Hadow, W. H. I, 1907.
Hales, J. W. V, 1877, 1897, 1900.
Hall, A. V, 1884, 1900.
Hallam, H. VI, 1837.
Halliwell[-Phillipps], J. O. II, 1865; VI, 1882.
Hansen, A. IIIe, 1885.
Harris, F. VI, 1909, 1912.
Harrison, W. A. V, 1884, 1885; VI, 1884.
Hazlitt, W. II, 1852.
Hazlitt, W. C. V, 1865; VI, 1874, 1903.
Hegedüs, S. von. V, 1913.
Hemingway, S. B. V, 1910.
Henderson, W. A. V, 1902.
Henry, F. IIIb, 1900; V, 1900.
Heraud, J. A. V, 1862.
Herford, C. H. II, 1900.
Hermanas, Dos. IIIg, 1877.
Hertzberg, W. V, 1878.
Hitchcock, E. A. IV, 1865.
Holland, B. V, 1910.
Housman, R. F. VI, 1835.
Hubbard, E. I, 1899.
Hudson, H. N. I, 1903; II, 1856, 1911.
Hugo, F. V. IIIb, 1857.
Hunt, L. VI, 1867.
Hunter, J. VI, 1845.

Ibbs, E. A. I, 1913.
Ingleby, C. M. IV, 1872; V, 1873, 1903; VI, 1874.

Iorio, A. J. I, 1912.
Isaac, H. [Later Conrad, H.] V, 1878, 1882, 1884.

D. J. V, 1909.
Jabez [*pseud.* for Ingleby]. V, 1874, 1875, 1877.
Jackson, E. A. IV, 1904.
Jaggard, W. VI, 1911.
Jameson, A. B. M. VI, 1829.
Johnson, J. IV, 1899.
Jones, Tom. V, 1913.
Jordan, W. IIIa, 1861.
Jusserand, J. J. VI, 1909.

Karpf, C. VI, 1869.
Kasprowicz, J. IIIh, 1907.
Keightley, T. II, 1865.
Kenny, T. VI, 1864.
Kent, S. IV, 1915.
Kinnear, B. G. VI, 1883.
Klein, D. L. V, 1905.
Kliem, H. VI, 1915.
Knight, C. II, 1838, 1843.
Kock, E. A. V, 1910.
Kralik, R. von. V, 1907.
Krauss, F. IIIa, 1872; V, 1879, 1881; VI, 1882.
Kreyssig, F. V, 1864; VI, 1858.

Lachmann, K. IIIa, 1820.
Lafond, E. IIIb, 1836.
Lee, S. I, 1905; II, 1908; V, 1898, 1900, 1909; VI, 1898, 1904, 1910.
Lee, S. A. VI, 1867.
Legis, R. H. V, 1876, 1877.
Leigh, G. A. V, 1897.
Leo, F. A. IIIa, 1872; V, 1888.
Lettsom, W. N. VI, 1860.
Lichtenberger, E. IV, 1877.
Liddell, M. H. V, 1902.
Lintott, B. II, 1710.
Luce, M. VI, 1906.

C. B. M. V, 1887.
J. M. IV, 1904.
Mabie, H. W. V, 1909; VI, 1900.
Mackail, J. W. VI, 1911, 1912.
Mackay, C. V, 1884.
MacMahan, A. B. IV, 1909.
Main, D. M. VI, 1880.
Malone, E. II, 1780, 1790.
Marchi, L. de. IV, 1891.
Massey, G. IV, 1866, 1888; V, 1864, 1867.
Mauntz, A. von. IIIa, 1894; V, 1893, 1897; VI, 1897, 1903.
McClumpha, C. F. V, 1900, 1901, 1904.
Minto, W. VI, 1874.
Montégut, E. IIIb, 1873.
Montmorency, J. E. G. de. V, 1912.
Moore, T. S. I, 1899, 1903.
More, P. E. V, 1904.
Morgan, A. V, 1885.
Morlaix, A. V, 1834.
Morley, H. VI, 1895.
Mortemart, C. II, 1908.
Mosher, T. B. I, 1901.

Neidhardt, A. IIIa, 1870.
Neil, S. V, 1867, 1873; VI, 1861.
Neilson, W. A. II, 1906.
Ne Quid Nimis. V, 1903.
Netto, I. V, 1910.
Newdigate-Newdegate, Lady. VI, 1897.
Nichols, B. VI, 1903.
Nicholson, B. V, 1869, 1879, 1883, 1887, 1889, 1891, 1892.
Norwood, T. W. V, 1889.
Nyblom, C. R. IIId, 1871.

O'Flanagan, J. I. IV, 1902.
Olivieri, A. IIIc, 1890.
Ormsby, W. E. V, 1902.
Ortlepp, E. IIIa, 1840.
Ospovat, H. I, 1899.
Oulton, W. C. II, 1804.

Palgrave, F. T. II, 1865.
Palmer, G. H. IV, 1912.
Pattison, M. VI, 1883.
Pemberton, J. V, 1908, 1909.
Platt, A. V, 1911.
Plumptre, E. H. V, 1889.
Porter, C. II, 1912.
Praetorius, C. I, 1886.
Price, H. T. V, 1913.
Price, T. R. VI, 1902.

J. G. R. V, 1859.
Raleigh, W. VI, 1907.
Reed, E. B. VI, 1912.
Reed, H. VI, 1857.
Regis, G. IIIa, 1836.
Reichel, E. V, 1902.
Reimer, H. VI, 1908.
Richardson, D. L. V, 1834.
Robertson, J. M. VI, 1897.

Robinson, G. & J. II, 1797.
Rödder, P. IV, 1913.
Rolfe, W. J. I, 1883; V, 1884, 1889, 1891, 1894, 1895, 1899; VI, 1904.
Ross, G. VI, 1867.
Rossetti, W. M. VI, 1878.
Rushton, W. L. V, 1899.

J. M. S. V, 1898.
Sachs. V, 1890.
Saenger, E. IIIa, 1909.
Saintsbury, G. VI, 1908, 1910.
Sanfelice, E. IIIc, 1898.
Sarrazin, G. V, 1895, 1896, 1898, 1914; VI, 1897, 1906.
Schelling, F. E. VI, 1895.
Schlegel, A. W. von. VI, 1809.
Schmidt, A. VI, 1874.
Schücking, L. L. V, 1907.
Schumacher, A. IIIa, 1827.
Sewell, G. II, 1725.
Sharp, W. II, 1885.
Shaw, G. B. V, 1911.
Shepherd, R. H. VI, 1866.
Sherborne, V, 1896.
Shindler, R. V, 1892.
Sievers, E. W. VI, 1866.
Simpson, P. VI, 1911.
Simpson, R. IV, 1868.
Simrock, K. IIIa, 1867.
Smith, A. R. II, 1885.
Smith, G. C. M. V, 1914.
Spalding, T. A. V, 1878.
Spence, R. M. V, 1896.
Speriend. V, 1875.
Spring, L. W. V, 1894.
Staunton, H. II, 1860; V, 1873.
Steevens, G. II, 1766.
Stengel, E. V, 1881.
Stone, E. D. V, 1876, 1904.
Stopes, C. C. I, 1904; V, 1890, 1898, 1900, 1913; VI, 1915.
Stronach, G. V, 1903.
Swinburne, A. C. V, 1880.

D. C. T. V, 1887.
Taine, H. A. VI, 1863.
Tannenbaum, S. V, 1914.
Tausig, P. V, 1904.
Tieck, L. V, 1826.
Tirinelli, G. V, 1878.
Towndrow, R. F. V, 1904.
Travers, S. S. V, 1880.
Treglown, E. G. I, 1895.
Tschischwitz, B. IIIa, 1870.
Tyler, T. I, 1886, 1890; IV, 1898; V, 1880, 1884, 1885, 1888, 1889, 1890, 1891, 1892, 1897, 1898.

Ulrici, H. VI, 1839.
Underhill, W. V, 1890.
Urban, S. V, 1898.

Valpy, A. J. II, 1834.
Vaughn, J. V, 1897.
Verity, A. W. II, 1890.

Wagner, E. IIIa, 1840.
Wailly, A. F. L. de. V, 1834.
Walker, W. S. VI, 1860.
Walsh, C. M. I, 1908.
Walters, C. IV, 1899; V, 1898, 1899.
Wendell, B. VI, 1894.
White, F. A. V, 1900.
White, R. G. II, 1865.
Wilde, O. V, 1889.
Wilkins, E. H. V, 1915.
Winsor, J. VI, 1879.
Wolff, M. J. IIIa, 1903; V, 1908, 1911, 1916.
Wordsworth, W. VI, 1815.
Wright, W. A. II, 1864, 1866.
Wyndham, G. II, 1898.

Y. Y. V, 1900.
Yeatman, J. P. VI, 1896.

Zoltan, V. IIIi, 1909.

INDEX TO THE COMMENTARY

Words and phrases from the text of the Sonnets are cited without initial capitals.

Absolute infinitive, 149.
abuse, 114.
acceptable, 27.
accessory, 97, 98.
accident, 291.
action, 163.
Adonis, 132.
advance, 193.
advised respects, 124.
Æschylus, 24.
Age, Sh.'s, 63, 157, 333.
aggravate, 356.
alien, 192.
all (= any), 183.
all away, 186.
all-eating, 21.
all-oblivious, 142.
allow, 266.
all-too-precious, 208.
all tyrant, 362.
amiss (n.), 96, 366.
Anima mundi, doctrine of, 250.
answer (= pay), 302.
Anthologia Latina, 370.
Anthologia Palatina, 369, 370.
antique, 52, 243.
antiquity, 158, 253.
approve, 114, 177, 359.
April, 228.
argument, 104, 194, 234, 238.
Aristotle, 241.
Armada, defeat of, 247.
Arms, grant of to Sh., 77, 99.
array, 354–56.
arrest (n.), 183.
art, 43, 167, 172, 335.
arts, 193.
Assonance, 162, 226, 228.
Aston, Sir R., 208.
astonished, 208.
astronomy, 42.
attaint (n.), 199.
attainted, 212.
audit, 302.
Augustine, 57.
Ausonius, 56.
aye me, 113.

Baif, de, 79, 182, 227.
Barley-break, 348.
Barnes, B., 200, 206, 209, 279; *Divine Century*, 353; *Parthenophil*, 59, 70, 79, 121, 196, 202, 211, 232, 321, 322.
Barnfield, R., 121, 209; *Affectionate Shepherd*, 63, 228.
barren rage, 41.
Bath, 371.
beated, 157.
Beaumont, F., 295.
beauteous roof, 36.
beauty's effect, 28.
Beauty, theme of, 86, 135, 233, 235.
becoming, 364.
becoming of, 307.
beds' revenues, 342.
bed-vow broke, 368.
begetter, 5–10, 105.
Belleau, 227.
Belvedere, 13.
beshrew that heart, 321.
besides, 66.
bestow, 76.
better angel, 348, 349.
better part, 106, 184.
better spirit, 195, 209.
bevel, 285.
Beza, 109.
Bible, 31, 38, 146, 151, 167.
bide, 149, 336.
Blackness, 304–06.
blacks, 191.
blazon, 243.
blenches, 259.
blind soul, 328.
Blond beauty, 304–06.
blots, 98.
blunt, 238.
Boccaccio, 349.
Bodenham, J., 13.
Book of Common Prayer, 146, 274.

books, 66.
bore the canopy, 295.
borne, 171.
both your poets, 202.
bounty, 133.
bower, 306.
brand, 263.
brass eternal, 161.
bravery, 93.
breed, 39.
breather, 198.
Breton: *Soul's Harmony*, 357.
bright in dark, 116.
Browning, 204.
Bruno, G., 103, 151, 250, 351, 358.

Campanella, 151.
Campion, 200.
candles, 59.
canker, 95.
canker-blooms, 134.
canopy, 295.
Capitalization, 146, 167, 197, 224.
carcanet, 131.
care, 145.
Carey: *Chrononhotonthologus*, 308.
case, 253.
cast his sum, 124.
Catullus, 364.
Chapman, G., 61, 62, 174, 188, 193, 200, 205, 207, 209, 290, 339.
character, 206.
charge, 356.
Chaucer, 243, 353.
check, 45, 149.
cheer, 226.
cherubins, 271.
Chiastic construction, 79, 186.
child of state, 290.
choirs, 182.
chopt, 158.
'cide, 121.
clear, 204.
closure of my breast, 123.
Codex amoris, 65.
Coleridge: *Christabel*, 281.
colour, 235.
comment, 45, 212.
common, 174.
commons, 331.
compeers by night, 208.
compile, 193, 205.
composed wonder, 152.
Compound epithets, 146.
compound sweet, 296.
compounds strange, 188.
conceit, 45, 76.
confound, 27, 33, 153, 173.
Constable, Sonnets of, 60, 69, 70, 121, 226, 230, 242, 243, 308, 314, 336.
contracted, 18, 145.
controlling, 56.
convert, 37, 43.
correct correction, 264.
countenance, 209.
counterfeit, 46, 132.
couplement, 58.
crooked, 153.
Cupid, 300.
curse, 204.
Cycles, doctrine of, 150, 288.

Daiphantus, 32.
damasked, 316.
Daniel: *Cleopatra*, 106; *Complaint of Rosamond*, 68; Sonnets, 16, 26, 41, 59, 63, 65, 69, 77, 78, 89, 104, 139, 159, 160, 182, 200, 211, 213, 224, 231, 240.
Dante, 18, 57, 65, 79, 119, 120, 126, 222, 227, 351.
darkly bright, 116.
dateless, 85, 371.
Davenant, Jane, 348.
Davies, J. (of Hereford), 59, 66, 199, 200, 209, 261, 324, 353.
Davies, Sir J.: *Gulling Sonnets*, 75, 322.
Davies, R., 106.
Davison, F., 193, 199.
dear, 101, 341.
dearths, 43.
dear time's waste, 85.
debate (n.), 213.
debateth, 45.
dedicated words, 199.
Dedication, sonnets of, 75.
Dee, J., 208.
defeat, 56, 156.
Dekker, 72; *Satiromastix*, 5, 11, 12.
denotes, 361.
departest, 37.
desert, 125, 180.
Desportes, 79, 139, 182.
determinate, 211.
determination, 41.
devouring time, 52.
dial, 189.
difference, 241.
disabled, 167.
discloses, 135.

distil, 135.
Dog-rose, 134.
doom, 351.
Drayton, 209; *Harmony of the Church*, 206; *Heroical Epistles*, 200; *Legend of Matilda*, 16; *Moon-Calf*, 171; *Polyolbion*, 199, 208; Sonnets, 49, 63, 70, 103, 104, 120, 139, 159, 171, 197, 210, 213, 247, 265, 274, 321, 323, 338, 343, 347, 358.
dressings of a former sight, 289.
drop in, 214.
Drummond of Hawthornden, 83, 227.
Dryden, 56.
Du Bellay, 61, 118, 141.
dullness, 143.
dumb presagers, 67, 68.

eager, 278.
Ecclesiastes, 151, 167.
eclipse endur'd, 250.
Edward III, 91, 220, 342.
eisel, 263.
Elements, the four, 118, 119.
Elizabeth, Queen, 95, 105, 125, 158, 198, 203, 244–49, 251, 292, 295, 371.
Elliptical construction, 202.
Emaricdulfe, 310.
engrossed, 321.
enlarge, 178.
Ennius, 139, 198.
entertain the time, 106.
Enueg, 168.
Envoy sonnets, 76, 88, 136, 183, 189, 299.
envy, 308.
Erasmus, 28.
Essex, 35, 55, 73, 245–46, 248–49, 273, 288–93, 298.
Euripides, 85.
Eve's apple, 218.
except, 359.
exchang'd, 255.
expense, 85, 220, 312.
expiate, 63.
extern, 296.
Extravagant Shepherd, 316.
eye (or eyes), 19, 21, 34, 218, 240.
Eye and heart, conceit of, 120–21.

Fairfax (Tasso), 59.
fair (n.), 48, 50, 58, 171, 201.
fairing, 306.
favor, 269, 296.
fear of trust, 66.
feed on death, 357.
Fenton: *Monophyle*, 57.
Field, R., 250.
filed, 206, 209.
fire out, 349.
fitted, 280.
Fitton, Mrs., 295, 333, 343, 368.
five wits, 339.
fixed, 236.
fleets, 52.
Fletcher, G.: *Licia*, 371.
Florio, 138, 200, 229.
flourish, 153.
foison, 132.
fond, 24.
fond on, 204.
fools of time, 292–93.
for (= because), 135.
for (= to prevent), 130.
forlorn, 91.
form, 213.
for my love, 110.
for shame, 35.
fortify, 160.
Fortune, 83.
forty winters, 20.
forward, 231.
frame, 70.
frank, 26.
free, 26.
frequent, 276.
fresh, 49, 253.
friend, 85.
fury, 234.
Fytton (see Fitton).

Gascoigne, 63.
gaze, 27.
general, 372.
get, 31.
go, 129, 316.
Golding (Ovid), 52, 106, 118, 138, 140, 151, 152, 153, 160, 302.
gored, 257–58.
got my use, 192.
gravity, 124.
greeing, 271.
Greene, R., 209; *Orpharion*, 113.
greet, 284.
Griffin, 196; *Fidessa*, 60, 353.
grow (= be), 202.
Guarini, 26.
Guillim: *Display of Heraldry*, 102.
Gunpowder Plot, 291, 293.
gust, 271.

habit, 334.
had a father, 41.
Hair, false, 172.
hallowed, 253.
Hamnet Sh., 214, 253, 303.
Harvey, G., 359.
Hathaway, Anne, 226.
Hathaway, W., 7.
heavy Saturn, 228.
height, 275.
Helen, 132.
hell of time, 282.
Henry V, character of, 259.
Herbert, W. (see Pembroke).
heretic, 292.
Herodotus, 42.
Hesiod, 182.
Hews, 54.
high-most pitch, 31.
his (= its), 34.
Homer, 182.
honey (adj.), 164.
hope of orphans, 225.
Horace, 130, 136–39, 180, 184.
horse (pl.), 216.
hours, 27.
hue, 54, 240.
hugely politic, 292.
Hughes, W., 55.
Hunnis, W., 203.
husbandry, 41.
hymn, 206.

I (objective), 180.
I (= ay), 328.
I am that I am, 284.
Identity, conceit of, 64, 98, 156.
idolatry, 241.
Ignoto, 315.
ill-wrestling, 338.
imaginary, 79.
Immortality, theme of, 51, 136–41, 198.
importune, 343.
imprisoned absence, 148.
in act, 367.
indigest, 271.
indirectly, 170.
in effect, 207.
influence, 44, 193.
informer, 298.
in hope, 154.
insufficiency, 364.
intend, 79.
interest, 87, 183.
intitled in their parts, 102.
invention, 104, 151, 188, 238, 242.
Italic type, 18, 55–56, 325.
itself, 172.

jacks, 308.
jade, 129.
James I, 244, 246, 295.
Jamyn, 118, 227.
Jesuit plots, 291–93.
Jodelle, 330, 349, 359.
Jonson: *E. M. Out of his Humour*, 307; *Masque of Blackness*, 305; *Poetaster*, 138; *Translations*, 310; *Underwoods*, 340; *Volpone*, 13.
Journeying, sonnets of, 78, 117, 126.

Keats: *Endymion*, 49.
kind, 36.
kindness, 368.
knife (of death), 184.
knife (of Time), 160.

lace, 169.
Lameness, Sh.'s, 100, 213.
Languet, 42.
latch, 269.
Law, language of, 41, 121, 211, 302, 322.
lay, 236.
learned's, 193.
leese, 28.
Leicester, 125, 158.
length seem stronger, 81.
level, 277, 284.
likeness of a man, 340.
like of hearsay, 59.
Lilly (see Lyly).
limbecks, 280.
Linche: *Diella*, 59, 72, 300.
lines of life, 47.
Lingua, 315.
Lodge, 209; *Golden Legacy*, 313; *Phillis*, 300, 314, 316, 358.
Longfellow: *Purgatorio*, 351.
lovely, 135.
lovely argument, 194.
lovely boy, 300–01.
lover, 88.
Lucrece, dedication of, 74–76, 88, 296.
Lucretius, 26, 208.
Lyly: *Campaspe*, 84, 103, 306, 351; *Endimion*, 135; *Euphues*, 196; *Sapho & Phao*, 28.

main of light, 153.
makeless, 34.
Manuscript, sonnets in, 21–23, 33, 89, 135, 154, 164, 179, 252.
many's, 218.
Marianus, 370.
marigold, 73.
marjoram, 231.
Markham, G., 200.
Marlowe, 193–94, 208–09; *Hero & Leander*, 26, 32, 53, 56, 177; *Amores*, 307, 337, 339, 364.
Marot, 109.
Marston, *Pigmalion's Image*, 89.
Martial, 139, 183.
Massinger: *Fatal Dowry*, 38.
master (v.), 243.
master-mistress, 53.
melancholy, 119.
Meres: *Palladis Tamia*, 136–38.
Metre, details of, 28, 79, 83, 85, 119, 131, 142, 154, 156, 164, 178, 226, 243, 273, 282.
Michael Angelo, 186, 259, 268, 358.
million'd, 272.
Milton: *Comus*, 26.
mine untrue, 269.
minion, 302.
misplac'd, 167.
misprision, 211.
misuse, 368.
modern, 201.
moiety, 121.
Molière, 166, 331, 339, 364.
Montaigne, 130, 356.
more, 68.
morning-mourning, 320.
mortal moon, 246–47, 251.
motley, 257–58.
mouthed, 190.
mouths of men, 198.
moving, 77.
murd'rous shame, 34.
music to hear, 32.
my heaven, 259.

naigh no dull flesh, 128.
Nash, 193, 200, 209; *Piers Penniless*, 139, 208, 317; *Summer's Last Will*, 228.
nativity, 153.
nature's truth, 154.
nerves, 281.
new-fangled ill, 216.
oblivious, 142.
obsequious, 86, 297.
o'ergreen, 266.
o'erlook, 199.
offices, 190.
oft predict, 43.
old, 21.
only, 19.
ornament, 133.
or whether, 271.
other (pl.), 157, 206.
other mine, 323.
Ovid, 21, 37, 45, 52, 53, 77, 106, 116, 136–41, 146, 151, 152, 153, 161, 162, 163, 195–96, 202, 215, 237, 302, 305, 307, 336, 337, 339, 361, 364.
owe (= own), 51, 178.

pace forth, 142.
page, 254.
pain, 105, 340.
painting, 201.
Palatine Anthology, 369–70.
Parrot: *Springes for Woodcocks*, 324.
partake, 362.
part his function, 269.
parts of me, 87.
parts the shore, 144.
pass (n.), 238.
passion, 53.
past cure past care, 359.
patent, 211.
Peace of 1609, 249.
peace of you, 185.
Peacham: *Minerva Britannia*, 135.
Peele, 209.
Pembroke, Countess of, 25.
Pembroke, William Herbert, Earl of, 18, 52, 55, 110, 133, 146, 147, 198, 200, 224, 242, 277, 295, 304, 324, 343, 344.
pen, 197, 204.
perfects, 127.
perspective, 71.
Petrarch, 63, 65, 70, 78, 79, 83, 109, 120, 121, 126, 168, 186, 227, 231, 268, 269, 314, 358.
Petronius, 310–11.
Phœnix & Turtle, 98, 107.
pibled, 152.
Pindar, 139.
pity, 343.
plagues, 43.
Plato, 17, 180, 221, 358.
Platonism, 86, 103, 229, 235, 268, 349.

Pléiade, 188, 231.
pointing, 43.
policy, 278, 292.
poor beauty, 170.
poor rude lines, 88.
posting, 127.
predict (n.), 43.
prevent, 234.
prime, 176, 225.
privilege (v.), 149.
Profession, Sh.'s, 257, 260–63.
Propertius, 139.
prophetic soul, 250.
prove, 180, 329.
public means, 263.
Punctuation of Quarto, 19, 28, 29, 31, 34, 39, 43, 74, 83, 92, 208, 296.
pupil pen, 48.
Puritanism, 214, 285.
pursuit, 344.
pyramids, 288.

qualify, 255.
quest, 121.
question make, 39.
quick, 187.
quietus, 302.
quires, 182.

rack, 91.
rage, 49.
ragged, 29.
Raleigh, 65.
rank (adj.), 279, 285.
rank (n.), 287.
receipt, 329.
record (n.), 151, 289.
recured, 119.
reeks, 316.
region, 92.
reign, 285.
Relative, omission of, 26, 184, 323.
religious, 87.
remember, 282.
remove, 73, 274.
render, 297, 302.
reserve, 89.
reserve their character, 205.
respect, 99.
resty, 234.
revolt, 217.
revolution, 152.
Rhyme, peculiarities of, 37, 43, 125, 142, 155, 180, 211, 215, 351.
Rich, B., 209.
Rich, Lady Penelope, 146, 304, 357.
riches (sing.), 211.
Romaunt of the Rose, 18.
rondure, 58.
Ronsard, 70, 79, 118, 139–41, 182, 231, 234, 240, 286, 316, 359.
rose, 17, 170, 256.
Russell, Anne, 295.
Rutland, Lord, 264.

St. Evremond, 109.
salutation, 283.
Sappho, 139.
satire, 234.
Saturn, 228.
scanted, 276.
scarlet ornaments, 342.
seal, 342.
seat, 113.
seconds, 297.
seeing (n.), 170.
self-love, 24.
self-substantial, 19.
sense, 96, 266.
sensual, 96.
separable, 99.
servant, 146.
sessions, 84.
set a form, 213.
set light, 212.
several, 331.
shadow, 79, 103, 131, 133, 155, 170.
shady stealth, 190.
shame, 155, 180.
Shenstone, 371.
Shirley, 315.
show, 132, 135, 241.
sickle-hour, 301.
side (v.), 121.
Sidney, 72, 227; *Apologie for Poetrie*, 139; *Arcadia*, 16, 21, 25, 28, 29, 33, 36, 41, 48, 64, 278, 360; *Astrophel & Stella*, 42, 60, 61, 68, 78, 79, 81, 82, 86, 115, 119, 120, 126, 170, 188, 192, 204, 309, 310, 314, 315, 318, 319, 330, 336, 337, 348, 352, 358, 363, 365, 366.
sight, 85.
simplicity, 167.
simply, 334.
siren, 279.
slander, 318.
slow offence, 127.
Smith, W.: *Chloris*, 300.
soil, 174.

solve, 174.
Sonnet form or structure, 68, 97, 113, 125, 160, 168, 232, 243.
Sophocles, 24, 177.
soundless, 196.
Southampton, Earl of, 7, 18, 46, 47, 75, 95, 129, 132, 138, 185, 193–94, 200, 208, 209, 232, 242, 244–45, 247–48, 252, 287, 289–91, 295, 298, 345.
Southwell, 66, 355.
sovereign, 146.
Spenser, 65, 141, 195, 243; *Amoretti*, 44, 52, 59, 60, 66, 138, 139, 168, 186, 231, 268, 315; *Colin Clout*, 167; *Faerie Queene*, 54, 76, 93, 121, 178, 193; *Shepherd's Calendar*, 182; *Tears of the Muses*, 258.
spirit, 208, 312.
spite of fortune, 214.
sport, 223.
sportive blood, 284, 285.
stage, 44.
stain, 92.
stand on thorns, 232.
state, 162, 224, 290.
statute, 323.
stay, 45.
steeled, 70.
steep-up, 30.
steepy, 160.
still, 122.
store (n.), 38, 43, 162, 204, 329.
store (v.), 170.
strained, 200.
strains, 215.
strange, 132.
strangely, 259.
strangle, 213.
stretched metre, 49.
subdued, 263.
subscribes, 251.
successive, 306.
such that, 93.
Suckling: *Brennoralt*, 122, 231.
sufferance, 149.
suggest, 348.
suit, 320.
suited, 307.
summer's front, 237.
summer's story, 228.
suppose, 146.
Surrey, Earl of, 69, 78, 227.
suspect (n.), 177.
sweet boy, 253.
sweet-season'd, 185.
swift extremity, 127.
sympathized, 201.

tables, 286.
tallies, 287.
tame to sufferance, 149.
Tasso, 59, 63, 65, 70, 83, 117, 118, 132.
tell, 85, 334.
tend, 132.
tender (n.), 201.
Tennyson, 162, 254, 280.
tenure, 155.
Terence, 365.
terms divine, 357.
that (= quod), 142.
that due, 87, 106.
their-thy, 77, 79, 96, 102, 113, 116, 119, 121, 173, 178, 308.
this self, 110.
Thorpe, dedications of, 7, 10, 208.
thou-you, 40, 71, 240.
thought, 118.
thralled, 291.
thriftless, 21.
tickle, 301.
time, 39, 177, 277.
time remov'd, 225.
times, 37.
Time's chest, 164.
Time's fool, 275.
times in hope, 154.
time's pencil, 47.
tires, 132.
to (= in comparison with), 123.
Tofte: *Laura*, 300.
Tolomei, 370.
took, 122.
totter'd, 21.
to west, 92.
transfix, 153.
Transposed phrasing, 255, 263.
Travel, sonnets of, 78, 117, 126.
true in love, 58.
truth, 101, 123, 133, 154, 224, 235, 259, 333.
twire, 81.
Two Italian Gentlemen, 344.
Two Noble Kinsmen, 231.

unbless, 24.
unear'd, 24.
unfair (v.), 27.
unfathered, 291.
unhappily, 167.

unjust, 334.
unkind, 326–27.
unknown minds, 276.
unlook'd for, 72.
unrespected, 116, 135.
unswept, 141.
unthrift, 34.
untrimm'd, 50.
untrue, 180, 269.
use, 26, 29, 323.

vade, 135.
vaunt, 45.
Vautrollier, 250.
Vergil, 139, 240.
Vernon, Elizabeth, 229.
Vervins, Peace of, 249.
vild, 179.
virtuous lie, 180.
vulgar scandal, 265.

Waller, 308.
warrantise, 364.
Watson, 65; *Passionate Century*, 53; *Tears of Fancy*, 69, 70, 211.
wear out, 142.
Webster: *Duchess of Malfy*, 180.
well-contented day, 88.
what (= why), 336.
where (= whether), 152.
will, 146, 284, 323–26, 328, 329, 344.
Willobies Avisa, 221.
windows (= eyes), 72.
wink, 116, 143.
wit, 76.
without bail, 183.
woo'd of time, 177.
Wordsworth: *Prelude*, 165.
World-soul, doctrine of, 250.
world-without-end, 146.
worth, 274.
wrack, 302.
wrackful, 164.
wragged, 29.
Wyatt, 64, 65, 343, 351.

youngly, 37.
you-thou, 40, 71, 240.
your self, 40.

Zenodotus, 370.
Zepheria, 76, 316.

INDEX OF FIRST LINES

Accuse me thus, that I have scanted all (117) 276
Against my love shall be as I am now (63) 159
Against that time (if ever that time come) (49) 124
Ah wherefore with infection should he live (67). 169
Alack what poverty my Muse brings forth (103) 237
Alas 't is true, I have gone here and there (110) 257
As a decrepit father takes delight (37) 100
As an unperfect actor on the stage (23) 65
As fast as thou shalt wane so fast thou grow'st (11) 37
A womans face with natures owne hand painted (20) 53

Being your slave what should I doe but tend (57). 145
Beshrew that heart that makes my heart to groane (133) 321
Betwixt mine eye and heart a league is tooke (47) 122
Be wise as thou art cruell, do not presse (140) 337
But be contented when that fell arest (74) 183
But doe thy worst to steale thy selfe away (92) 217
But wherefore do not you a mightier waie (16) 46

Canst thou O cruell, say I love thee not (149) 362
Cupid laid by his brand and fell a sleepe (153) 369

Devouring time blunt thou the Lyons pawes (19) 51

Farewell thou art too deare for my possessing (87) 210
For shame deny that thou bear'st love to any (10) 35
From fairest creatures we desire increase (1) 15
From you have I beene absent in the spring (98) 227
Full many a glorious morning have I seene (33) 90

How can I then returne in happy plight (28) 80
How can my Muse want subject to invent (38) 104
How carefull was I when I tooke my way (48) 123
How heavie doe I journey on the way (50) 125
How like a Winter hath my absence beene (97) 225
How oft when thou my musike musike playst (128) 307
How sweet and lovely dost thou make the shame (95) 222

If my deare love were but the childe of state (124) 290
If the dull substance of my flesh were thought (44) 117
If their bee nothing new, but that which is (59) 150
If thou survive my well contented daie (32) 88
If thy soule check thee that I come so neere (136) 328
I grant thou wert not married to my Muse (82) 199
I never saw that you did painting need (83) 201
In faith I doe not love thee with mine eyes (141) 338
In loving thee thou know'st I am forsworne (152) 367

In the ould age blacke was not counted faire (127) 303
Is it for feare to wet a widdowes eye (9) 34
Is it thy wil, thy Image should keepe open (61) 155

Let me confesse that we two must be twaine (36) 98
Let me not to the marriage of true mindes (116) 273
Let not my love be cal'd Idolatrie (105) 241
Let those who are in favor with their stars (25) 72
Like as the waves make towards the pibled shore (60) 152
Like as to make our appetites more keene (118) 278
Loe as a carefull huswife runnes to catch (143) 344
Loe in the Orient when the gracious light (7) 30
Looke in thy glasse and tell the face thou vewest (3) 24
Lord of my love, to whome in vassalage (26) 74
Love is my sinne, and thy deare vertue hate (142) 341
Love is too young to know what conscience is (151) 365

Mine eye and heart are at a mortall warre (46) 120
Mine eye hath play'd the painter and hath steeld (24) 69
Musick to heare, why hear'st thou musick sadly (8) 32
My glasse shall not perswade me I am ould (22) 62
My love is as a feaver longing still (147) 358
My love is strengthned though more weake in seeming (102) 236
My Mistres eyes are nothing like the Sunne (130) 314
My toung-tide Muse in manners holds her still (85) 205

No more bee greev'd at that which thou hast done (35) 95
No! Time, thou shalt not bost that I doe change (123) 288
Noe longer mourne for me when I am dead (71) 179
Not from the stars do I my judgement plucke (14) 42
Not marble, nor the guilded monument (55) 136
Not mine owne feares, nor the prophetick soule (107) 244

O call not me to justifie the wrong (139) 335
O for my sake doe you with fortune chide (111) 260
O how I faint when I of you do write (80) 195
O least the world should taske you to recite (72) 180
O me! what eyes hath love put in my head (148) 360
O never say that I was false of heart (109) 255
O that you were your selfe, but love you are (13) 40
O thou my lovely Boy who in thy power (126) 299
Oh from what powre hast thou this powrefull might (150) 363
Oh how much more doth beautie beautious seeme (54) 133
Oh how thy worth with manners may I singe (39) 106
Oh truant Muse what shalbe thy amends (101) 235
Or I shall live your Epitaph to make (81) 197
Or whether doth my minde being crown'd with you (114) 271

Poore soule the center of my sinfull earth (146) 352

Say that thou didst forsake mee for some falt (89) 212
Shall I compare thee to a Summers day (18) 50
Since brasse, nor stone, nor earth, nor boundlesse sea (65) 163
Since I left you, mine eye is in my minde (113) 268
Sinne of selfe-love possesseth al mine eye (62) 156

So am I as the rich whose blessed key (52) 130
So are you to my thoughts as food to life (75) 185
So is it not with me as with that Muse (21) 58
So now I have confest that he is thine (134) 322
So oft have I invok'd thee for my Muse (78) 192
So shall I live, supposing thou art true (93) 218
Some glory in their birth, some in their skill (91) 216
Some say thy fault is youth, some wantonesse (96) 223
Sweet love renew thy force, be it not said (56) 143

Take all my loves, my love, yea take them all (40) 108
That God forbid, that made me first your slave (58) 148
That thou art blam'd shall not be thy defect (70) 175
That thou hast her it is not all my griefe (42) 114
That time of yeare thou maist in me behold (73) 181
That you were once unkind be-friends mee now (120) 281
The forward violet thus did I chide (99) 230
The little Love-God lying once asleepe (154) 372
The two other, slight ayre, and purging fire (45) 119
Th'expence of Spirit in a waste of shame (129) 309
Then hate me when thou wilt, if ever, now (90) 214
Then let not winters wragged hand deface (6) 29
They that have powre to hurt, and will doe none (94) 219
Thine eies I love, and they as pittying me (132) 319
Those howers that with gentle worke did frame (5) 27
Those lines that I before have writ doe lie (115) 272
Those lips that Loves owne hand did make (145) 350
Those parts of thee that the worlds eye doth view (69) 173
Those pretty wrongs that liberty commits (41) 112
Thou art as tiranous, so as thou art (131) 318
Thou blinde foole love, what doost thou to mine eyes (137) 330
Thus can my love excuse the slow offence (51) 127
Thus is his cheeke the map of daies out-worne (68) 171
Thy bosome is indeared with all hearts (31) 86
Thy guift, thy tables, are within my braine (122) 286
Thy glasse will shew thee how thy beauties were (77) 189
Tis better to be vile then vile esteemed (121) 283
To me faire friend you never can be old (104) 239
Two loves I have of comfort and dispaire (144) 346
Tyr'd with all these for restfull death I cry (66) 165

Unthrifty lovelinesse why dost thou spend (4) 25

Was it the proud full saile of his great verse (86) 207
Weary with toyle, I hast me to my bed (27) 78
Wer't ought to me I bore the canopy (125) 294
What is your substance, whereof are you made (53) 131
What potions have I drunke of Syren teares (119) 279
What 's in the braine that Inck may character (108) 252
When fortie Winters shall beseige thy brow (2) 20
When I consider every thing that growes (15) 44
When I doe count the clock that tels the time (12) 38
When I have seene by times fell hand defaced (64) 161
When in disgrace with Fortune and mens eyes (29) 82
When in the Chronicle of wasted time (106) 242

When most I winke then doe mine eyes best see (43) 115
When my love sweares that she is made of truth (138) 332
When thou shalt be dispode to set me light (88) 211
When to the Sessions of sweet silent thought (30) 84
Where art thou Muse that thou forgetst so long (100) 233
Whilst I alone did call upon thy ayde (79) 194
Who ever hath her wish, thou hast thy Will (135) 323
Who is it that sayes most, which can say more (84) 203
Who will beleeve my verse in time to come (17) 49
Why didst thou promise such a beautious day (34) 93
Why is my verse so barren of new pride (76) 187

Your love and pittie doth th'impression fill (112) 265

The Riverside Press
CAMBRIDGE . MASSACHUSETTS
U . S . A

Boston Public Library
3 9999 10503 250 0